

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 17, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As the Sun gives light to our world so may Your good Word, O God, give light to our hearts and minds. Take away the darkness of selfish thinking or petty concerns and instead renew our hearts that we will be sensitive to the needs of people everywhere. Open our minds that we may truly hear the call of the poor, the neglected, the injured, those who stand alone, the homeless, the refugee, and the lonely. Give us all a glimpse of Your will for our world, where truth and justice are honored, and love and mercy are the marks of our lines. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sanders, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 15, 1985:

H.R. 730. An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Cocopah Indian Tribe of Arizona certain land in Yuma County, AZ; and

H.R. 1847. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

## THE FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the Food Security Act of 1985 (H.R. 2000) that I introduced on April 4 contains provisions dealing with the peanut program. These provisions, in common with other provisions of the bill, are designed to serve as a framework for consideration, by the Committee on Agriculture and its subcommittees, of omnibus farm legislation.

Section 703 of H.R. 2000, which pertains to transfer of poundage quotas

for peanuts, could be read as generally permitting transfers of quotas to farms within the same State. This is incorrect. The intent of the bill, in this regard, is to maintain the status quo—that is, generally to restrict transfers of quotas to farms within the same county.

As I have indicated, the Food Security Act of 1985 is to be used as the markup vehicle during committee consideration of omnibus farm legislation this year. Therefore, I am introducing a clean bill that will not only clearly reflect the intent of the peanut provisions that I have discussed, but will also correct various typographical and technical errors that appear in H.R. 2000, as printed. The clean bill, together with H.R. 2000, will thus accurately fulfill the objective that I have envisioned.

## A MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT ON THE HANDICAPPED

(Mr. COELHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, this morning I sent the following letter to President Reagan:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your Education Secretary, William Bennett, is doing his best to fill Jim Watt's shoes as the most fanatical of your appointees.

As Senator Weicker revealed yesterday, he has appointed someone to "set the tone for the department" whose views on the handicapped are so outrageous they defy explanation.

This appointee, Eileen Gardner, has written that handicapped persons are themselves responsible for their conditions. They "summoned" and "created" their handicaps, she believes, and they "falsely assume that the lottery of life has penalized them at random." As a result, the handicapped become "ineffective malcontents."

Secretary Bennett contends that these beliefs are "respected" religious doctrine. I don't know what church he goes to, but I doubt seriously that America's 25,000 disabled veterans "respect" these beliefs. And neither do the two million Americans who, like myself, have epilepsy, or the 33 million who have some other type of handicap.

As one of her so-called "malcontents," I find these beliefs totally unacceptable, and as President of all Americans, including the handicapped, I call on you to withdraw her appointment.

Does this country really need or want someone in charge of handicapped programs who believes that children born with Downs Syndrome or born blind are to blame for their own conditions and therefore not worthy of any help from society?

To make matters worse, Ms. Gardner says the handicapped are selfish individuals be-

cause they don't appreciate the hardship they inflict on the "general population." Mr. President, the handicapped have enough problems; we don't need someone else who believes that life is simply a case of the haves vs. the have nots.

Sincerely,

TONY COELHO,  
Member of Congress.

## SENSE-OF-CONGRESS RESOLUTION CONDEMNING SOVIETS PULLED FROM CALENDAR

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 24 an American soldier, Maj. Arthur D. Nicholson, Jr., was cruelly murdered by a Soviet guard in Germany. After a sufficient time had passed for us to investigate the incident and find out the conditions, I introduced a resolution in the House to condemn the Soviets for that cruel murder. That resolution obtained 66 cosponsors, including 18 members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, made its way through the committee, and was brought to the floor of the House on the calendar for yesterday.

Early yesterday morning we were informed, without any prior notification, that the resolution had been pulled. After an entire day of investigation and inquiry, we were finally told, and I read today in the Washington Times, that the bill was pulled not by a Member of Congress but, without any congressional authorization, by a Mr. Brady, a staff member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I find this unacceptable. A staff member is not authorized to pull a bill off the calendar without any authorization or even any consultation with a Member of Congress. This cannot be accepted. Too much time had already passed. The Soviets' cruel punishment of killing a man for being, as Mr. Gorbachev has said, "in the wrong place" is something we must speak to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has expired.

□ 1210

## SOVIET RECIPROCITY

(Mr. HUTTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House joint resolution that directs the President to ensure that Soviet Union Government personnel in the United States are subject to the same requirements that the United States personnel in the Soviet Union are subject to.

Specifically, my resolution will require that conditions imposed upon U.S. Government personnel in the Soviet Union; that is, status, privileges, immunities, accommodations, travel, and facilities and so forth, of employees of the U.S. Government, will be imposed upon Soviet Union Government personnel in the United States.

According to the FBI, 40 percent of Soviet Union Government personnel in the United States are well-trained professional employees of the KGB and Soviet military intelligence officers of the GRU. Furthermore, the United States does not have an elaborate complex in the Soviet Union such as the Soviet Union has in the United States at Glen Cove, Long Island. The U.S. Government personnel in the Soviet Union are not allowed to purposefully travel where they choose while the Soviet Union Government personnel in the United States can travel virtually any where they desire—unrestrained.

This joint resolution would also create a general balance in terms of the numbers of officials and employees which is needed between our Nation's representation in the Soviet Union, and their representation here—we can no longer permit the Soviets to take advantage of this current imbalance. We must act now to inhibit furtherance of this situation.

I believe this resolution is long overdue and fully justified. I am sure this resolution has very strong support in the Senate, as a similar effort was initiated by Senators Huddleston and Goldwater during the 98th Congress.

#### LET JUSTICE BE DONE

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, please let justice be done. Seat Rick McIntyre.

Mr. Speaker, I have just come from a very small and very sad rally on the west front steps of our Capitol where about 120 Americans or future Americans, all of them former citizens of the Khmer Republic of Cambodia, are trying to remind this Congress what happened this week 10 years ago.

During April of 1975 this Congress of the United States, finally and tragically cut off all aid to Cambodia, both military and economic, and the almost immediate result was what we now call the killing fields, the dreaded and pre-

dicted blood bath the autogenocide, where a mass murderer named Pol Pot and his Communist followers known as the Khmer Rouge, slaughtered over 1½ million human beings, maybe 2½ million souls, possibly as high as 3 million men, women, children and babies.

What a legacy of horror for those who were here in 1975. If you were here, how did you vote?

There are only 155 Members left in this body who served during that April week of 1975. Two hundred and eighty of us have been elected subsequently. I do not know whether we are going to replay the history of betrayal in the coming days on the Communist contagion that is temporarily contained in the southern area of North America known as Central America, or if we are going to, as George Santayana warned, "Ignore history and thereby be cursed to relive it."

At least three of the nine Managua commandantes refer to themselves as Communists. By the way, Eden Pastora told me that not one of those nine fought in the revolution against Samozza. Not one heard a shot fired except in their earlier bank robbing days.

Thus, henceforth in the debate on resistance funding for clarity, I will no longer refer to the Communist leadership in Managua as Sandinistas but as Communists. The true Sandinistas are in the hills or visiting our offices in the person of Eden Pastora, and others, talking about the betrayal of their evolution which overthrew the oligara Samozza.

Let us not have communism spread in our hemisphere and curse more people to relive the famine if not the killing fields of Cambodia. Never again. Eight hundred and sixty priests and nuns in Nicaragua support Pope John Paul II and their 9 bishops. Only 52—52—here that, only 52 support the Communists. Are you listening, U.S. bishops?

#### MATCHED SHEETS FOR YOUR FUTON

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we hear reports of how the Japanese, try as they might, just can't seem to find anything "Made in America" that they'd like to buy.

The Japanese bureaucracy recently offered some suggestions. How about a matched sheet and pillowcase, fitted for American mattresses and pillows? Never mind that the Japanese have the wrong-sized mattresses. How about a beef thermometer? Never mind that the Japanese seldom buy beef—largely because of import restrictions.

I sympathize. I recently put together a list of Japanese goods that Ameri-

cans might like to buy. How about matched sheets for a "futon"—the traditional Japanese bed? How about special sushi tongs?

Perhaps we should wait to see how these Japanese imports sell before allowing Japan to sell us any cars or cameras or television sets.

Let me make a standing offer to the Japanese bureaucracy. Come to my Illinois district. Drop in at Lord & Taylor or Marshall Fields or Sears. Just maybe you'll see a few American goods you'd like to buy.

#### REAGAN'S 1984 PLATFORM: I PROMISE TO FORGET

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that President Reagan's 1984 platform could be summarized by saying: "I promise to forget."

This week the President said that he believes there are "very few people alive who remember World War II." That is not exactly someone that I would trust to protect the Social Security system, or anything else for that matter.

Well, I am alive and I remember last October when President Reagan promised that he would "absolutely battle against any suggestion of reducing" Social Security.

Well, the trumpet has sounded, the battle is beginning, and President Reagan is nowhere to be found. In fact, it appears he has suited up in his Teflon coat and defected to the other side.

Six months after vowing to protect Social Security he switched sides and must believe that very few of us will remember that 1984 promise.

Anyway, nothing ever seems to stick to him, so I guess it will not hurt.

I think a government has always been measured by how it treats people in the sunset of their lives or in the shadows of their lives. This President is getting very low marks on that measurement.

#### THE BENEFITS OF SPACE RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

(Mr. NELSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of being the chairman of the Space Subcommittee and it is my privilege to share that space research is now having a technology transfer that could revolutionize the medical operating room. Research recently at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California, a NASA



center, has developed a laser which may be successful in eliminating plaque from inside human arteries. This nonsurgical procedure could replace some bypass operations.

Additionally, Johns Hopkins as a result of the microminiaturization of computers due to space research, America's medical centers are experimenting with such a microcomputer to be implanted in the human body to release calculated doses of medicine for certain diseases.

This particular modern miracle of medicine, is the result of research and development from America's space program.

#### WHERE IS THE DEFICIT REDUCTION PROPOSAL OF THE DEMOCRATS?

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, Monday was April 15 and by statute the day for reporting of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1986 from our Budget Committee. Only once before in the 10-year history of the Budget Act has the April 15 reporting date not been met. With the country facing the prospect of a fiscal year 1986 budget deficit of \$230 billion, would you not have thought that the Democrat majority in this House, which incidentally has been constantly criticizing the President's budget reduction proposal, would have come forward with its own deficit reduction plan before the April 15 deadline?

□ 1220

I know our chairman has stated publicly not once but repeatedly that he wants to see at least a \$50 billion reduction in the fiscal year 1986 deficit. Mr. Speaker, why not let him come forward with the Democratic Party's plan now? The people are expecting us to go forward with a deficit reduction plan during this year. Let us unveil the Democrat deficit reduction plan so the people can make a determination as to which plan they prefer, or maybe, just maybe they would prefer a combination of both.

In any event, since they know the need for reductions, they should have an opportunity to see our Democrat friends' plan and how they would make reductions to a \$230 billion anticipated deficit.

#### CENTRAL AMERICA: DOSE OF REALITY—NO. 1

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the first paragraph of the War Powers Act reads:

It is the purpose of this act to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States and insure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and to the continued use of such forces in hostilities or in such situations.

We are in a clandestine war in Central America—a war being conducted by our President but never authorized by the Congress—and well on our way to being in a open war there, as well. This is precisely the situation contemplated by the War Powers Act.

First, the act refers to "United States Armed Forces." Do we have U.S. Armed Forces in Central America? Of course we do—we have numerous CIA personnel and military advisers, tens of thousands of uniformed personnel from every branch of the U.S. military, and even National Guardsmen in Central America. If these are not U.S. forces, then who are?

Second, are our Armed Forces present in all the countries of Central America? Of course they are. And are there hostilities—defined by Webster as overt acts of war—in Central America? Of course there are. Do a civil war in Nicaragua and a civil war in El Salvador constitute hostilities? Of course they do—these are wars, complete with soldiers and tanks and guns, where people die.

The War Powers Act is law, and it is a law that embodies the constitutional mandate that the Congress—and only the Congress—declares war—and only when the President together with the Congress decides such action is necessary.

The President evaded the War Powers Act in Lebanon. He violated the act in Grenada. And he's violating the act now. He has acted with impunity, and Congress has supinely acquiesced.

The result in Central America can only be tragic.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSERS IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. WEBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from California, Mr. BOB DORNAN, and I had an opportunity to visit Nicaragua. We had a very interesting and lengthy interview with Archbishop Obando y Bravo of Nicaragua. I will later on in a special order be inserting the entire text of that interview with the archbishop in the RECORD, but I would just like to read a very brief response of the archbishop on the question of human rights abuses by the Contras.

I asked the archbishop, "What about the members of the resistance, the Contras?"

The archbishop's response, word for word, was:

I don't have any direct relationship with them at a personal level. They are in the mountains of Matagalpa, Jinotega, and the Atlantic coast. The reports sent to me by the bishops who work there show that they have not received any problems from them, none.

I asked, as a followup,

Less problems than priests and bishops have had from the government?

The archbishop's response:

The reports that I have received from the priests of those areas is that they have not had any problems with them.

Mr. Speaker, the human rights abusers in Nicaragua are not the Contras, they are the Communist government in Managua.

#### AMERICAN MILITARY IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, how right you were. When the President submitted his recent proposal to aid the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries, you said Mr. Reagan would not be satisfied until he had Americans fighting there.

This morning's New York Times carries a front page story which validates that prediction. According to the Times, a report labeled "top secret" and sent to two committees of the Congress by the President yesterday says that while the administration had for now ruled out "direct application of United States military force," it warned that this course "must realistically be recognized as an eventual option given our stakes in the region if other policy alternatives fail."

Now, General Gorman has already said that the Contras cannot win it on their own, so if the President gets his way American troops are coming. That spells it out, Mr. Speaker.

But why is it that that report is secret? Why is the President practicing this deception, calling his proposal as one of "humanitarian" assistance?

I'll tell you why.

Because he knows that the only way he can get the American people to go along with his proposal is to trick them into it.

Congress should not hesitate one moment in rejecting the President's outrageous proposal.

# **SPEAKER O'NEILL SHOULD REVEAL IMPORTANT INSIGHTS FROM HIS MEETING WITH GORBACHEV**

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times this morning has a very disturbing quote relating to our own scheduling here in the House. It quotes you as saying that the subject of the shooting of Major Nicholson last month in East Germany came up during a 4-hour session last week with Gorbachev, and it quotes you as saying, "Gorbachev was very distinct in accusing our man of being at the wrong place—and taking no blame whatsoever."

Yesterday we were to have voted on a resolution condemning the Soviet Union for killing an American officer. That resolution was pulled.

The same day that resolution was pulled you moved the date for voting on freedom fighter aid up by 1 week.

If you learned anything in your meeting with Gorbachev which you think this House should know so this House can understand why you are scheduling in the way which withdraws the condemnation of the Soviet Union and accelerates an effort on your part to defeat aid for the freedom fighters, it would be helpful to this House if you would report in public on what it is you learned from Mr. Gorbachev.

## **NATIONAL LOTTERY/DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 1985**

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I offer part 2 of my "painless deficit reduction package." Yesterday, I offered a 6-month tax amnesty proposal which could produce \$20 billion in revenues.

Today I am introducing the National Lottery/Deficit Reduction Act of 1985. Under the bill, persons aged 18 and over would be able to buy tickets at \$1 each. The lottery would award five prizes a month, for each of 12 separate lotteries held each year; 75 percent of all revenues would be earmarked to reduce the deficit.

How much would be raised? No one is totally certain. However, in the 18 States that have lotteries, revenues exceed \$5 billion. In the most successful States, per capita revenue is over \$1 a week. Nationally, that could produce revenues of over \$12 billion.

The real answer rests with how many people play. If every person eligible bought nine \$1 tickets a month for a year we would slash our deficit by over \$18 billion. The more tickets purchased the more would be raised.

I believe a national lottery is an idea whose time has come, especially if it can offer us a way to reduce our deficit without resorting to tax increases or Draconian cuts in spending.

## **REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1612**

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] be removed from the list of cosponsors for H.R. 1612.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## **NICARAGUAN ALLIES**

(Mr. COURTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, a West German linked to the Baader-Meinhof gang is a counterintelligence officer in the Nicaraguan Army. Another commands an artillery battalion. Five Italians, all former Red Brigade leaders, serve as noncommissioned officers in the Nicaraguan Army. A Basque ETA terrorist awaits trial in Costa Rica on charges of attempting to assassinate Contra commander Eden Pastora. Both Spain and Italy have formally protested the sanctuary Nicaragua gives to several dozen European leftist militants.

Before coming to power in 1979, Sandinistas trained and fought beside experienced guerrillas in Central America and the Middle East. Relations with Cuba and the PLO were especially close. Today, "proletarian internationalism" deems that the governors of Nicaragua make returns for services rendered.

The Swiss Review of World Affairs has called Nicaragua the PLO's "most important base on the Latin American mainland." Ties to Colonel Qadhafi are strong, as infusions of Libyan money and armaments have proven. The Sandinistas are linked to terrorists in Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, and other Latin countries.

Americans cannot afford not to notice. According to the FBI, fully two-thirds of the terrorist attacks in this country in 1983 were linked to Latin America. Furthermore, compelling evidence links Sandinista officials to narcotics sales in U.S. black markets.

As debate about our Central American policies continues, we should not forget the Nicaraguan hand in the international terror network.

# **NO WONDER SOME OF US GET UPSET ABOUT THE WAY THINGS GET DONE IN THIS HOUSE**

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, people sometimes wonder why some of us get upset from time to time about the way things get done in this House. Well, there are two headlines in this morning's Washington Times that help tell the story. One, the top headline says "O'NEILL tips scales against aid to the Contras." It seems to me that the pro-Communist government in Nicaragua must be awfully pleased with that scheduling.

Another headline says "Denouncing of Soviet slaying abruptly derailed in the House." The Communist government in Moscow must be awfully pleased by that kind of scheduling.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we get upset.

## **DEMOCRATS ARE GETTING AWAY FROM THE POLITICAL CENTER**

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party says it wants to move back into the center of American politics. The opportunity is at hand in the upcoming vote on Nicaragua.

Will Democratic leadership pull the rug out from under those fighting totalitarian communism in Central America and thus absorb the responsibility for the firm establishment of a new Soviet base on the mainland of this hemisphere? Or will they eschew party politics and allow themselves and their members to vote their consciences on this crucial issue?

The responsibility for the full communization of Nicaragua and all that means for the future of this country will be laid squarely at the doorstep of the national Democratic leadership. This will have a chilling impact on the more conservative and moderate members of the Democratic Party who have been seeking to move their party further into the center. Nowhere will this be truer than in the South, in the West, and in the Southwest, the scene of national debacles at the Presidential level in recent years for the Democrats.

## **LUNDI SENG, CAMBODIAN REFUGEE, WINS THIRD PLACE IN SPELLING BEE**

(Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)



Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is those of us who have difficulty with correct spellings and pronunciations of words who most admire the annual winners of our local spelling bee competitions. Recently, the greater Grand Rapids area spelling bee finals were completed with a most unusual series of circumstances.

As the finalists competed, the judges exhausted the entire list of challenge words for the competition. Among the tongue-twisters were the words "cinerous," "amaranthine," "quixotism," "schadenfreude," "thanatophidia," and "onomatopoeia." Still, the finalists would not capitulate!

When all was said and done, the final winner was an 11-year-old fifth-grader from Seymour Christian School by the name of Laurie Admiraal, who will be coming to Washington, DC, to represent our community in the national finals this June. The winning word, by the way, was "densitometer"—a word now well-known to Grand Rapids area schoolchildren.

In second place was Robert Tyson, a 14-year-old eighth-grader at City Middle-High School. And in third place was Lundi Seng, a 13-year-old Cambodian refugee. Lundi is an eighth-grader at Millbrook Christian School, and has lived in this country only 4 years. She saw her parents killed by the Communists in Viet Nam, and fled to our country knowing not a single word of English. Now she can lay claim, along with Larie Admiraal and Robert Tyson, of being a better speller than most of us in this body!

#### THROW THIS HOUSE OVERBOARD

(Mr. COBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the House a letter that I have here that was sent by Patti Combs from Bedford, IN. This is the Eighth District of Indiana. Now, the letter has a teabag attached. She says in one clear and precise sentence: "I resent having taxation but no representation." And she has two exclamation marks there.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the House get with it, exercise the true justice for the people of the Eighth District of Indiana, and seat the certified winner of that race, Rick McIntyre.

Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the people, including Patti Combs, of the Eighth District of Indiana for resenting what this House has done. Our founders had a Boston tea party; and I think probably the people from the Eighth District, if we do not go ahead and do what we are supposed to do, are going to come down and throw this House overboard.

I thank the Speaker.

#### REQUEST FOR PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday House Resolution 125 was pulled from the calendar, I am told, by a staff member of the committee. Mr. Speaker, my question is: Is this acceptable procedure in this House for a staff member to pull legislation from the calendar?

The SPEAKER. No. 1, the gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry. But, No. 2, the Chair would be willing to answer the question.

The suspension list is the prerogative of the Speaker of the House and of the majority party; two of the powers of the Speaker are recognition and the power of scheduling. It is the normal procedure in this House when a committee wants to get a bill on the suspension list, as was requested, that it usually comes out of a committee unanimously and a letter comes from the chairman. That is why it is put on the list. It is the understanding that meetings were taking place between those representing the Russian Army and the U.S. Army over the facts of what happened.

□ 1240

Nobody can condone, and the intelligence reports of the United States which I have had the privilege of looking at certainly condemn, and we all condemn the actions that took place of the Russian soldier as he literally murdered our American.

The agreement has been that there are 12 enclaves in which we, as Americans, in the Russian zone are entitled to go into. I guess it is for verification. They have 12 zones in which they come into in West Germany for the most part that is protected by the Americans.

On a unilateral basis, the Americans never shot at Russians observers. On the Russian side, it is our understanding that according to their policy they were supposed to fire a warning shot, which our intelligence says never happened.

The negotiation is going on or has just been completed, I do not know which, to see if there could be an agreement between both that neither would use weapons or arms, and particularly the Russians, as we had unilaterally not been using them to detain Russians.

In view of that, it was the right of the committee to call and ask that the matter be pulled. So at the request of the committee, the matter was removed from the suspension list as of yesterday.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. YATES of Illinois;  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida;  
Mr. SOLARZ of New York;  
Mr. GARCIA of New York; and  
Mr. GREEN of New York.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1210, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 129 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 129

*Resolved*, That at anytime after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1210) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for related purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and each section of said substitute shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. [Mr. MURTHA]. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I

yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 129 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1210, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology and makes in order a science committee amendment in the nature of a substitute which is now printed in the bill. This amendment will be considered as original text for purposes of amendment under the 5-minute rule and each section shall be considered as having been read.

In addition, House Resolution 129 facilitates consideration of the bill by waiving points of order against the bill for violation of the 3-day layover rule, clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommend, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1210 authorizes \$1.6 billion for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1986. The authorization level represents an increase of \$97.8 million over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1985, and is virtually the same as the administration's request.

The National Science Foundation is the Government's major agency which provides support for basic research in the physical, biological and social sciences. Reflecting our Nation's continuing commitment to scientific development, the bill authorizes \$1.4 billion for research and related activities, and provides \$82 million for graduate research grants in the fields of science and engineering.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule so that we may proceed to the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. QUILLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. Although there is legitimate concern over waiving the 3-day rule, I urge adoption of the rule to expedite the business of the House.

This reauthorization for the National Science Foundation is a routine bill but also an important bill. H.R. 1210 authorizes \$1.6 billion in fiscal year 1986 as requested by the administration. This is \$98 million more than the fiscal year 1985 appropriation.

There is at least one provision of the bill of concern to the administration. Under present law the President appoints four of the National Science Foundation's Assistant Directors. This bill changes that procedure by giving the Foundation's Director the authority to appoint all the Assistant Directors. Since this is an open rule, however, this matter can be debated fully and voted up or down when the bill is opened for amendment under the 5-

minute rule. The will of the House will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a severe critic of the National Science Foundation in the past because of the asinine grant awards that were handed out. I don't believe for a minute that we have totally stopped them. But I do know that we have made some genuine progress over the past several years in halting this terrible waste of the taxpayers' money.

I want to congratulate the members of the Committee on Science and Technology for helping in this effort to stop these asinine grants. They have done a good job and they have saved money from being spent on useless studies. We have pulled in the reins on these absurd grants but we need to keep a sharp eye on this so that these ridiculous research grants don't reappear.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this open rule so the House can proceed to the consideration of this bill which is of importance to our Nation's science community and our national scientific research program.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. I have no further requests for time either, Mr. Speaker, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the bill, H.R. 1210.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES FOR 1984—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, April 17, 1985.)

#### NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 129 and rule

XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1210.

□ 1250

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1210) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for related purposes, with Mr. BEILENSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA].

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the National Science Foundation authorization for fiscal year 1986, H.R. 1210, provides a total authorization of \$1.6 billion. These funds are a critical investment in our Nation's future and represent our continued commitment to expanding the frontiers of science. H.R. 1210, as reported by the Committee on Science and Technology, enjoys strong bipartisan support of the committee members and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

The total authorization of \$1.6 billion includes \$1.39 billion for research and related activities, \$82 million for science and engineering education, \$120.1 million for Antarctic research, and \$1 million for special foreign currency. With the exception of the science and engineering education directorate, H.R. 1210 is identical to the President's request. In this area, H.R. 1210 indicates \$82 million. It is the committee's stated intention that \$50.5 million is for new obligational authority and \$31.5 million are carry-over funds from fiscal year 1985 to fiscal year 1986. Therefore, the new obligational authority contained in H.R. 1210 is \$1.57 billion; the same amount as the President's proposed budget for NSF.

H.R. 1210 also provides continued support for recent initiatives especially for advanced scientific computing—supercomputers—and engineering research facilities. The Foundation has announced the selection of four supercomputers centers. These centers will utilize the most sophisticated computing instrumentation available and will offer access to large-scale computing facilities to researchers in all fields. The engineering research centers initi-



ated in fiscal year 1985 bring together researchers from universities and industry and will receive sustained support in H.R. 1210. Both the computer centers and the engineering centers represent Government, industry, and academic partnerships in research and cost sharing, thus effectively enhancing the Federal investment.

H.R. 1210 makes several changes in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. The most prominent of these changes in the elevation of fundamental engineering research to a coequal status with basic scientific research in the Foundation. This change was included in the authorization bill (H.R. 4974) passed by the Congress last year.

Other important features of the bill include: First, emphasis on basic scientific research to better understand the phenomena contributing to acid rain; second, a study of the research facilities needs of colleges and universities; third, a requirement that appropriate scientific review be conducted before the closing of a national facility; and fourth, a requirement that the NSF Director report to the Congress on the applicable recommendations of the Grace Commission and the OMB report entitled "Management of the U.S. Government in 1986."

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1210 is a well balanced and reasonable proposal. It has strong bipartisan support of the members of the Committee on Science and Technology. I urge my colleagues to support the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1210, the fiscal year 1986 authorization for the National Science Foundation, authorizes \$1.6 billion for NSF, an amount identical to the President's request and an increase of \$66.5 million over the fiscal year 1985 appropriation level.

Mr. Chairman, this bill passed the Committee on Science and Technology overwhelmingly and represents a bipartisan effort. I feel the committee has every right to be proud of this bill because the amount authorized represents a modest 4-percent increase over fiscal year 1985, and it reaffirms this Nation's commitment to science education.

This budget addresses the serious problems facing this country because of a decline in science and engineering education, due mainly to a severe shortage of qualified mathematics and science teachers and a dwindling number of qualified faculty members at colleges and universities. The committee has made it clear that the fiscal year 1986 authorization for science and engineering education should be used fully.

We understand that a freeze amendment, similar to the one which passed during consideration of the NASA authorization, will be offered during

today's debate. I am ready to abide by the will of this body.

I would stress, as we go into this debate, that this bill is a bipartisan effort of the committee and represents our best efforts to accommodate the needs of the agency, the requests of the administration and the realities of our economy.

I urge this body to approve H.R. 1210, the National Science Foundation bill.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I am very delighted to yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN], the chairman of the subcommittee and one who has played such an important role in crafting this piece of legislation for us.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the chairman for yielding. At the outset, I want to stress again the appreciation that I have personally for the contributions that have been made by other Members on all levels of this subcommittee and committee, particularly the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA], and the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN], who have given special attention to the National Science Foundation in the process of our hearings and in the process of our marking up. Particular recognition should go to the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for active participation in this process. He deserves credit for much that is reflected in this bill.

Science is bipartisan. It has no philosophical bent. The bill that we bring before you today from the Science and Technology Committee reflects the basic underlying recognition of the national interest we have in science from both sides of the aisle.

By its charter, the Congress placed responsibility for the health and progress of U.S. science in the National Science Foundation. Given the challenges that we face from abroad and the rapid advancement in knowledge and science, no part of our Federal Government has a greater role to play, and must fulfill its role with more effectiveness if our national interest is to be protected than the National Science Foundation.

I would hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will respect the importance and weight that both the committee and the administration have given this Foundation in their budget to offset inflation of 4 percent.

Overall, this bill authorizes a total of \$1.6 billion for the next fiscal year. Of this amount, \$1.39 billion is for research and related activities. These amounts are within and identical to the President's request. The only area that exceeds the President's request is

in the area of science and engineering education where we essentially provide for the maintenance of the Science and Engineering Education Program at the levels the President requested should there be an adverse disposition of the administration's request to carry over from 1985 to 1986.

So this authorization is on all fours with that recommended by the administration in a most important area for our national interests.

As reported by the committee, we require no less than \$1 million be committed for activities related to the exploration of ethics and values in science and technology. We essentially would maintain what was a \$2 million effort last year on a million dollar level because of the importance that ethics and values in the area of science have. When you consider that we are spending some \$50 billion of Government money on basic research, hustling pell mell into a future dominated by science and technology, certainly \$1 million would be well spent to explore dilemmas of ethics and values that science poses for our society. So we have a floor or a requirement in this authorization that, of the funds expended in these various research efforts, \$1 million be reserved for that function.

We also accept only part of the reduction proposed by the administration for policy research and analysis, an area that is central to developing any wisdom in guiding the direction of our programs as a whole. Of particular value in this area in the past has been consideration given to risk assessment, an area of fundamental importance to the public. Policy research and analysis was reduced by \$2 million in the administration budget. We add \$1 million back and ask that \$3 million of the overall be attributed to this function.

We also have an emphasis in the bill on acid rain, the importance of which we clearly all recognize. The bill also requires a study of the deficiency of research facilities for colleges and universities, an area we are only beginning to appreciate, but one that will require vast commitment in the future.

□ 1300

The bill proposes several changes in the basic charter for the National Science Foundation. The most significant of these is broadening the mandate to include responsibility for the health of fundamental engineering research. This change comes out of the widespread recognition in the scientific community that the distinction between engineering and science, at least on the fundamental research level, is now blurred beyond recognition, and that if we are to have a broad-based scientific capability it must include fostering fundamental engineering re-

search. So we include parallel references to science and engineering throughout the charter so that the Science Foundation can play the most constructive role in that area.

At the same time, we make two other noteworthy changes. One is that we approve a request that the National Science Board be able to delegate greater authority to the Director of the National Science Foundation to approve contracts that the Foundation would enter into. This we do on a trial basis with strict reporting requirements, because we do want the Director of the National Science Foundation to be sensitive to the Board and the Board's judgment, and we want to be sure that the Board is exercising a broad range of oversight function.

Second, we remove the requirement that several of the assistant directorships be appointed by the President. We are faced, in these several years, with vacancies in important positions that have gone on far too long because the White House is not totally focused on the National Science Foundation, and their personnel approval process has suffered from bottlenecks that have resulted in longstanding vacancies.

It is generally believed by almost all those involved in the National Science Foundation on a practical basis that, since the Director and the Deputy Director are already appointees of the President, there is certainly sufficient Presidential control and influence over the National Science Foundation. These are not political jobs that are being disposed of here; their function is not political. It is to follow the merits of the science and encourage the merits of the science. It would seem that these assistant directorships would be in good hands being appointed by the Director and we would not suffer longstanding delays because of a structural requirement.

Mr. Chairman, this is a strong and well-balanced proposal; it sustains growth in several critical areas. The supercomputer area, I would like to underscore because the truth of the matter is that there is little access to supercomputers in our country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] will, I am sure, lay out a real horror story where Nobel Prize winning minds have less access to supercomputers than graduate students in Europe.

Supercomputers are the tool which we will use to design the next generation of computers; they are the lynch pin to progress in this area, and we should certainly sustain the limited support that is given on an enhanced basis.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of the Members for what is a most critical bill.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Republican of the subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Technology which is responsible for moving this legislation, I am pleased to bring before you today a bipartisan request for the reauthorization of the National Science Foundation, 1986 fiscal year.

On March 25, the Science Research and Technology Subcommittee took action on H.R. 1210, the administration's bill introduced as requested. Then on April 3, 1985, the full Science and Technology Committee unanimously reported H.R. 1210 by voice vote.

The bill, H.R. 1210, being considered by the House today, supports the President's request for \$1.569 billion in new obligatory authority plus a proposed deferral of \$31.5 million from fiscal year 1985 to fiscal year 1986. By accepting the administration's overall funding level, the committee recommends minor adjustments within the budget requiring that no less than \$1 million be available for the Ethics and Values in Science and Technology Program, and no less than \$3 million be available for the Policy Research and Analysis Program.

Several Members have heard and voiced concern over the proposed elimination of the \$1 million EVIST Program, as well as PRA which was proposed for a 50-percent reduction. However, the committee did not feel that the Federal deficit situation warranted increases to the proposed budget, and, therefore, we reauthorized these programs from within the existing funds requested. Moreover, we are greatly concerned that any further readjustments to the fiscal year 1986 budget could lead to serious problems within the research and education activities sponsored by NSF.

It is not without constraints that NSF requests a 4.4 percent increase over fiscal year 1985 appropriated levels. In fact, though the budget presents overall positive signs, facility upgrades have been necessarily drawn out, and as I mentioned, a deferral of \$31.5 million in education moneys requested. Though NSF's request is roughly \$67 million more in new budget authority over fiscal year 1985, this 4.4 percent is doing no more than allowing NSF to have the same purchasing power in fiscal year 1986 than they presently have in fiscal year 1985. Quoting from the CBO estimate, "H.R. 1210 is assessed to have no inflationary effect of prices and costs in the operation of the national economy."

As I have stated, in addition to the deferral, certain facility upgrades have been drawn out—for example:

The very large baseline array, which was proposed for construction in fiscal year 1985, has been delayed twice now and may possibly be faced with further delays due to congressional directives. This initiative has been and continues to be strongly supported by the Science and Technology Committee, and we believe any further delays are unwise.

Also—

The Advanced Supercomputer Division at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, CO, will have a longer schedule for its supercomputer upgrade.

We believe there are further insidious consequences of budget alterations and reductions to the various research accounts. It has become increasingly clear to the committee that our national facilities are being squeezed as a result of tight budgets and the demands placed upon research communities to accept freezes in many or all other programs to allow for new initiatives. In lieu of this situation, the committee emphasizes that appropriate scientific review will be conducted before closure of any national facility, including but not necessarily limited to the NSF and the National Science Board.

The committee believes that such facilities are national resources and in many cases involve the participation of other agencies and outside users.

Furthermore, H.R. 1210 requires:

First, that emphasis will be placed on scientific research to support a better understanding of the phenomena contributing to acid rain;

Second, that NSF will conduct a study of the research facilities' needs of universities;

Third, that the Director of NSF will report to Congress on those recommendations pertaining to implementation of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control—Grace Commission Report—and the OMB report "Management of the U.S. Government in 1986"; and

Fourth, that all Assistant Directors be in NSF Senior Executive Branch level appointments rather than Presidential appointments, which four of the seven currently are.

Finally, H.R. 1210 contains administration requested changes in statutory authority:

First, allowing National Science Board meeting announcements and background materials to be sent using alternative delivery services other than registered or certified mail. The committee concurred with this amendment.

Second, to permit the National Science Board to use its discretion in reviewing grants exceeding "\$50,000 per year for a period not to exceed 3 years" by delegating that authority to the Director of the Foundation. The



committee reached a compromise on the proposed language.

Third, NSF is seeking an exclusion from the Freedom of Information Act, as the Bureau of Census currently has, which protects proprietary information obtained from industries/companies while in the course of conducted surveys, questionnaires, and similar such studies. The committee accepted this amendment wholeheartedly.

Fourth, NSF submitted the engineering amendment sponsored by Congressmen SKEEN of New Mexico and BROWN of California. The committee concurred.

In spite of the budgetary constraints, NSF is proposing an increase in advanced scientific computing. An increase of \$4.7 million over the fiscal year 1985 level for the advanced scientific computing centers; and is promoting further research in computer science and engineering, networking and access time.

As we are all aware, NSF has announced the establishment in fiscal year 1985 or three national supercomputer centers, plus one experimental center. In addition, NSF is vigorously pursuing a fourth center, the impetus which was provided by the transfer of a Cray-1S from NASA to NSF. The subcommittee applauds this effort to work this arrangement within its budgetary levels.

I congratulate NSF for their work in the supercomputer area. It was a program we in the Science Committee initiated discussion of in the 1st session of the 98th Congress and which the House supported in fiscal year 1985. NSF is clearly addressing the needs of the research communities previously excluded from this significantly advanced technology.

I would also like to acknowledge the attention NSF has given to the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984. This act was passed by the Science and Technology Committee during the 98th Congress.

To this end, I would like to focus my remarks on the excellent leadership in place at the Foundation. Eric Bloch is to be commended for a very sound proposal. Mr. Bloch has been recognized this year as a recipient of the President's National Technology Medal. The Science and Technology Committee recognizes him for one of the most straightforward and accountable exchanges before a congressional committee in defense of a Federal agency's budget.

Finally, I thank the members of the Science and Technology Committee for an admirable show of bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I urge the entire House to support the budget for NSF as proposed by the administration and the Committee on Science and Technology by voting for H.R. 1210.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to an especially important provision of H.R. 1210, which amends the National Science Foundation Organic Act of 1950 in order to clarify and emphasize the Foundation's responsibility for fundamental engineering research and education. Along with my good friend from California, GEORGE BROWN, I sponsored similar legislation last year, which this body unanimously approved. While I have my problems with other parts of this legislation, I would like to commend the National Science Foundation for including this provision of H.R. 1210, and urge your support.

The purpose of this provision is to more clearly establish the role of the NSF in supporting our Nation's base of research and talent in both science and engineering. While NSF currently operates a healthy engineering program, it does so without the benefit of a well-defined engineering mission. By explicitly recognizing the important role of NSF in supporting fundamental engineering research and education, we will strengthen the ability of the Foundation to address critical national issues.

If our Nation is to remain competitive in world technology markets, we must maintain and improve our base of university research and talent, both of which are essential ingredients for innovation and technological progress. Under the leadership of Erich Bloch and Nam Suh, the National Science Foundation has been making significant gains in meeting engineering research and education needs.

With the passage of an engineering mission change, the contribution of NSF to American excellence in science and engineering will be even greater. By bringing science and engineering closer together in the Federal structure, the overall climate for innovation can only improve.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and the subcommittee amendment to freeze the funding levels for fiscal year 1986 to the 1985 funding levels. I realize that this means an authorization request for Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth and Ocean Sciences that is about \$12 million below the original committee markup but still more than \$11 million above the fiscal 1985 level. While targeting reductions to certain programs, this freeze takes into consideration priorities based on science research and technology considerations. I want

to commend the chairman for addressing fiscal responsibility in a fair and balanced manner.

The very long baseline array is funded under the AAEO programs. This project is one of the great technological breakthroughs of modern science and engineering. The VLBA is a national, and potentially international project. Scientists and institutions from different parts of the United States are involved in the design and construction of VLBA, and astronomers from all over the world will be able to use the facility. The VLBA, at this stage, will involve the construction of 10 antenna and control building sites in different parts of the United States. The data collected by these sights will be gathered and analyzed at an array operations center at the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, the Association of Universities Inc., under contract with the National Science Foundation, has embarked on a project which have profound implications for our understanding of the universe. The VLBA could measure astronomical positions with incredible accuracy. It will reveal details within distant galaxies and help us to gain valuable insights into the nature of the many different kinds of matter in space. It will have very practical applications for the measurement of continental drift, the Earth's rate of rotation, and many other areas that concern Earth as well as astronomical science.

Unfortunately, while the design for this project is already underway, the 1985 funds have been held up twice. The first delay was to last until April 1 and the second on May 15. This has not only slowed down the design process, it has also prevented the commitment of funds for construction of the first site in Pie Town which is in my congressional district. The administration's National Science Foundation budget summary for fiscal year 1986 expresses strong support for the VLBA, including it among the highest priority AAEO programs.

□ 1310

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the committee regarding the VLBA program, if I could.

Mr. FUQUA. I will be glad to answer any question the gentleman has, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make this inquiry of the committee chairman: I understand the committee report contains language expressing support for the VLBA as a high priority among the AAEO programs. I just wanted that substantiated by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, let me say also that the National Academy of Sciences has identified this project as the highest-priority major new instrument for ground astronomy in the 1980's. We support that concept.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, should there be a freeze amendment, I understand that this program would also be a high priority?

Mr. FUQUA. It is the committee's intention that this still remain as a very high priority.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, let me seek one further clarification regarding the rumors about the Sacramento Peak Observatory, that it would be closed without proper review of the wisdom of such a termination. I understand that in H.R. 1210, as amended, there is a provision that precludes the closing of Sacramento Peak. Is that correct?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it provides that no funds shall be spent toward the closure of a national facility without appropriate scientific review, including a review by the appropriate advisory committee of the National Science Foundation and also committees of the National Science Board. So any decision must be based on scientific review and not just an arbitrary closure.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the committee chairman. I also wish to thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WAGNER] for the oversight hearings he held in New Mexico on these programs, and I thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] for his relentless pursuit of scientific excellence and his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of this very important piece of legislation, H.R. 1210.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] has expired.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

WITHDRAWAL OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 125 FROM LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I arrived at my office to be informed that House Resolution 125 had been withdrawn from the calendar. Naturally, I was concerned regarding who had withdrawn the resolution from the calendar, and I and my staff and other Members of Congress and their staffs spent the entire day trying to find out who had withdrawn the resolution from the calendar. We were unable to find any Member of Congress who would admit to having withdrawn the resolution from the calendar, let alone any who even knew in advance that it was going to be done.

This was true of all the Members we were able to contact on the committee from which the resolution had come to the floor.

We spent the entire night trying to find out. This morning earlier I raised the question as a point of parliamentary procedure, and I was advised by the Speaker that the committee had requested this. I had been earlier told by a staff member of the committee that he alone had requested that, without any consultation with any member of the committee or any Member of Congress.

My concern is that a staff member would withdraw legislation from the calendar. I do not think that is appropriate procedure.

I would like to have some clarification on this matter, and I would like any Member of Congress who did indeed authorize this staff member to withdraw this legislation to come forward so this matter can be cleared up. I think it is a matter of essential concern to the Members of this Congress regarding who should make these kinds of decisions, staff members or Members of Congress.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor when the gentleman made his parliamentary inquiry of the Speaker, and I understood very clearly from the Speaker's response to him that the request came from the committee. Has the gentleman had an opportunity to discuss this matter, for instance, with the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ARMEY. I had a call in to the chairman of the committee, and I have not been able to locate him. However, from all the information we had yesterday, there was not even a suggestion that the chairman of the committee nor any other member of the committee made that authorization. Indeed the staff member told me very distinctly himself that he had done it solely on his own recognition.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I also look forward to the resolution of this question because the Speaker was fairly precise in his response to the gentleman's inquiry and made it very clear that the changing of the schedule could only come about as the result of a request from the committee, and obviously the committee is not members of the staff but only Members of Congress. But if the gentleman indicates there are no Members of Congress willing to come forward and indicate they have specifically

requested the change in the calendar, then we have a contradiction on our hands that will indeed have to be resolved.

So I commend the gentleman for raising this point, and I look forward to the members of the committee resolving this question.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I would like to make one other point.

In repeated efforts yesterday to contact both the Speaker's office and the majority leader's office, we were always referred to this same staff member, and it seems that this is the only person on the Hill that we can find who is willing to accept any responsibility for having withdrawn this resolution. Again I say this is not acceptable. This is the business of the Congress, not the business of the staff.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG].

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before the House and in support of the fine effort made by the committee in bringing out the National Science Foundation authorization bill this year.

I would like to address one specific element of that National Science Foundation bill and talk about what I hope will be the activities of the National Science Foundation in the area of education. There is, as I understand it, \$81.5 million authorized for educational activities under the educational directorate. Of those moneys, about \$25 million is authorized or directed toward informal educational activities, and under that category we have what is known as telecommunication educational activities, including the funding of such programs as "3-2-1 Contact" and "Sesame Street" and now a new program which NSF is initiating called "The Brain." I want to commend the National Science Foundation for its initiative in starting up the program called "The Brain," and I want to encourage the NSF staff and those people serving within the educational directorate to move forward aggressively in the use of telecommunications in the education of our children.

In my experience in the field of educating children and as a prior member of this committee, having had the honor to serve on this committee for 4 years, it became fairly apparent to me that what we have available today to educate our children is a substantial amount of materials and information and really excellent programming. But what we have failed to do is to get that material and programming out to the individuals who can benefit from it the most, basically the children. I think we have really failed to aggres-



sively use to its fullest extent the most incredible communicative facility in the world, television.

When we think about the fact that every home in this country, for all intents and purposes, has a television and that children in this country spend a massive amount of time in front of that television, it is really a crying shame and a terrible waste of that tremendous facility that we are not in-putting the children of this Nation with better opportunities for education. There is really no reason at all why on Saturday morning a child should not have available to him or her the opportunity to turn on a channel which will be as interesting to that child as cartoons and which will be getting across a message or at least a substantive idea which will go a long way toward educating that child in at least math and science to fairly objective disciplines.

Thus I would hope that this committee and also the National Science Foundation will continue the strong work they have initiated since the beginning of 1980 in reestablishing the educational directorate and especially pushing the use of the medium of television in education and especially continuing to proceed with the development of more programs such as "The Brain," "3-2-1 Contact," and "Sesame Street."

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I am happy to yield to the ranking member.

□ 1320

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman in the well is much too modest when he congratulates the National Science Foundation for the momentum in this area, because I would tell my colleagues in the House that it has been the gentleman in the well who has been a leader in this effort. I applaud him for that leadership. I could not agree more.

Our youngsters, the children across America, spend a disproportionate share of their time in front of that television set and he would like and I would like and we all should hope for the day when most of that time will be educational time and we use our modern telecommunications capabilities to the maximum advantage to provide the best possible educational opportunities for our young people, particularly in the area of science and engineering.

The gentleman has done an outstanding job, I say to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] and I want to publicly applaud the gentleman for that leadership.

Mr. GREGG. Well, I thank the gentleman for his generous comments.

It just seems to me that the National Science Foundation really is in a unique position to be the point on this

issue with their talent, ability, and national reputation.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALGREN. Well, I, too, want to say and recognize the contribution of the gentleman from New Hampshire and his focus on this particular point, not only as a Member of Congress in the committee, but also as someone who has children and hopes that they learn from television, rather than not learn from television.

As the gentleman knows, in response to his interest in the soundness of that idea, we do at least underline in the report that the Science Foundation should be encouraged to develop this avenue with value and it is because of the gentleman in the well and we appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reinforce my view that the chairman of this subcommittee has done a superb job in moving and helping the National Science Foundation find its way through this effort. I congratulate the gentleman on the report. I congratulate him on the substance of the bill. I just hope we can keep the ball rolling and I know we will follow the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. WALGREN. We appreciate the gentleman's support and miss the gentleman on the committee.

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, the National Science Foundation fiscal year 1986 budget authorization bill, H.R. 1210, puts this body in a quandary. On the one hand, we want to signal our support for the critical role the Foundation plays in our Nation's research base—a role that has never been so important as it is today. At the same time, however, there is a concern in this body that overrides everything else—a concern that our first priority is to get control of hemorrhaging deficits that have afflicted this Nation over the last 4 years.

I believe that in any other time, H.R. 1210 would sail through this debate unamended, a credit to the oversight functions so ably performed by the Science and Technology Committee. In today's precarious economic climate, however, our duty is clear—we must seek to hold the line on budget increases and push for a freeze on many domestic spending programs. I therefore support the effort to hold fiscal year 1986 budget authority for NSF to the fiscal year 1985 appropriations level.

But I would hasten to add, Mr. Chairman, that we can't have it both ways. For if we are to apply this ra-

tionale to a freeze on many portions of our nondefense, domestic spending sector, then we cannot shirk our responsibility and not apply it to certain portions of our defense sector as well.

In this connection I note with not a little consternation that in a time when NSF's budget request is for an increase of 7 percent—the bulk of which is in support for basic research—the DOD's basic research budget request is for an increase of 16 percent. It's about time we start to understand that when we are forced to shortchange efforts such as those of the National Science Foundation because there is no room to maneuver in a budget with a \$200 billion deficit, we are shortchanging our national security. For while we may face threats to this security in a hostile international environment, we must not forget that the challenge to our long-run industrial competitiveness is no less a threat to our Nation.

I hope this body keeps this in mind when we begin to look at certain aspects of the Defense Department's research budget which holds support for some gold-plated weapons gimmickry. For the true costs of this gimmickry are the many opportunities we are giving up today in supporting a freeze on the Foundation's budget.●

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, when I was going through this legislation, I noticed that there was a specific statutory provision requiring the National Science Foundation to do a study on the causes and effects of acid rain.

I suppose that I have no problems with a study; it will only remove the doubts in the minds of some people on the causes of this major environmental problem. But doing a study on the causes of acid rain is a little like doing a study on the health effects of cigarette smoking. Research is not enough—we know the causes—now is the time to work on solutions.

I do not want this statutory language to serve as a stopgap measure. I do not want the Members of the House to be able to pat themselves on the back today and say that we've dealt with the acid rain problem through this bill. We haven't. We've made a very tentative first step.

All the studies in the world will not change the fact that there are over 200 "dead" lakes in the Adirondacks. It will not change the fact that lakes are dying every day in Massachusetts. It will not change the fact that the Quabbin Reservoir has extremely acidic water.

Let's do the study. Let's remove all doubts from the minds of those who don't want to face this problem. But at the same time, let's move toward concrete solutions. My bill, H.R. 1030, provides those solutions. It gets at the root of the problem by requiring

actual reductions in the amount of sulfur dioxide emissions.

Let me reiterate that I will certainly not oppose this bill. But I want to urge the NSF to actually conduct this study. And I urge the Congress to begin looking at solutions to America's No. 1 environmental problem: Acid rain.●

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from New Mexico have any further requests for time?

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986".*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

Sec. 2. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation, for the fiscal year 1986, the sums set forth in the following categories:

(1) Advanced Scientific Computing, \$46,230,000.

(2) Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth, and Ocean Sciences, \$372,170,000.

(3) Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences, \$272,050,000.

(4) Engineering, \$170,070,000.

(5) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, \$428,970,000.

(6) Scientific, Technological, and International Affairs, \$38,360,000.

(7) Program Development and Management, \$69,900,000.

(8) Science and Engineering Education, \$82,000,000.

(9) United States Antarctic Program, \$120,100,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, from the amounts authorized under subsection (a)—

(1) not less than \$1,000,000 shall be available for the ethics and values in science and technology program; and

(2) not less than \$3,000,000 shall be available for the Policy Research and Analysis program.

(c) In the obligation, use, and expenditure of the amounts appropriated for Biotic Systems and Resources under the authority provided in subsection (a)(3) and for Atmospheric Sciences under the authority provided in subsection (a)(2), emphasis shall be placed on basic scientific research to support a better understanding of the phenomena that contribute to acid rain.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: At the end of section 2 (page 15, after line 9), add the following new subsection:

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this section and section 6 shall not exceed \$1,501,792,000.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is essentially a freeze level amendment. It is similar in nature to the amendment that was offered to the space bill that came before the House just prior to the recess.

Let me first acknowledge the work of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON], who at the time of the space legislation brought their amendment to the floor, had prepared a similar kind of amendment for the bill today.

My amendment does track the amendment that they had. The reason for my offering it, in all honesty, is I think the committee at this point is in recognition of the fact that this is something that the House wants to do and we need to begin to bring our internal adjustments to what was apparently the House position.

I do want to make the point that we did come out of the committee at the Presidential level, at the level of request in the NSF bill, and that was a conscious attempt to try to stick with budgetary practice and priority, a priority set by the President in order to try to move science programs ahead, despite his attempts to effect an overall freeze on spending; but it is apparent that the House wants to move probably a little further than that and in the case of these amendments say that we want a 1985 appropriation level for the authorization of this particular bill. That is effectively what this amendment would achieve.

It says that we will not spend more than \$1,500,792,000 in the upcoming fiscal year 1986.

I would urge the House to adopt this kind of a freeze approach to build upon what we did in the first authorization bill that came on the House floor, the one that came out of NASA.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the committee adjusting to the new historical bipartisan effort led by Congressman MORRISON, myself and others, to go back to the 1985 freeze budget level.

As I understand, correct me if I am wrong, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the original proposal was about 6 percent over last year, if that is correct.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct. As I say, that reflected an attempt by the committee to stay within the level that was requested by the ad-

ministration, but the administration did have an increased priority for science within the budget, so therefore had increased that above the 1985 spending level.

Mr. PURSELL. Therefore, we take it back 6 percent to comply with the 1985 budget level, which would be consistent with what we did with NASA last Wednesday evening.

So I want to congratulate the committee, the chairman, the gentleman from Florida, and our great chairman, the gentleman from Albuquerque, NM, MANNY LUJAN, and the gentleman in the well for making this adjustment and complying with our precedent here, because it is historical that if we can be consistent, and I know the gentleman in the well has been consistent over the years, to look at fiscal integrity in trying to achieve a balanced budget goal.

So we have been successful with NASA and we can be successful today in the adoption of this amendment. I think we can carry that to the Bureau of Standards legislation tomorrow in which I have an amendment filed with the Clerk to do the same thing in principle, so that we can get a balanced budget and achieve at least a \$38 to \$50 billion reduction in the deficit this year.

I congratulate the committee. I served on the Committee on Science and Technology some years ago. It is an outstanding committee.

This way it allows the committee to reprogram those dollars into the functional category within the bill itself and I think that is appropriate, rather than somebody on the floor arbitrarily jumping in and trying to change the priorities within the National Science Foundation.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I want to thank the gentleman for his statement.

Let me say to the gentleman that I would hope that as bills come forth in the future that we are also going to try where the President has requested lower levels that we will attempt to come in at those levels of the Presidential budget as well, that we are not talking about a freeze of priorities at the 1985 level, because the freeze of priorities at the 1985 level still produces massive deficits.

It seems to me that if we are willing to cut back where that seems appropriate, then we ought to also be willing to cut back in some of those areas where the Presidential budget is below what the freeze would take us. That way, we really do begin to have some control of the deficit.

I would hope that we are going to look in that direction, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.



(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, we will be looking at that on a case-by-case basis as the bills come before the floor.

The question before the public and this Nation is not below spending levels of 1986 or 1985. The question is whether Congress has consistently been spending at a faster rate. Medicare is growing at the rate of 15 percent per year. Medicaid, 10.2 percent. So the rate of growth is the bottom line in which the public is asking fiscal integrity and fiscal responsibility here.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PURSELL. I also suggest that we, some of our group, are suggesting that our freeze apply across the board to that \$1 trillion budget. That means defense, that means domestic budget areas, plus; so we will be going into certain categories, maybe 50 or 60 different programs of the Federal Government, looking for additional spending, because the freeze itself if you were to apply the freeze across the board to today's Federal budget, the 1986 budget numbers, the CBO numbers, you are only going to come up with about \$38 billion.

The gentleman is absolutely correct. Those are not enough dollars to achieve not only the 1986 goal of \$50 billion, but the deficit which will be greater in 1987 and in 1988, simply because the recovery, with all due respect to my supply side colleagues, will not be recovering at a 4-percent growth rate of the GNP.

So I suggest we are going to have to look at additional budget cuts later on, over and above the freeze in which we can get agreement within the House, Republicans and Democrats, and with the Senate and with the administration.

I think the public is asking for that, so I congratulate the committee again for its excellent work.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman.

I think it is important to make the point, as the gentleman has there, that if you take the March figures, the latest figures we have, the March figures, they show that revenues to the Federal Government are growing at an 11 percent greater rate than they were in March of the year prior.

□ 1330

That means that we have a rate of revenue growth to the Federal Government of almost three times the rate of inflation. That should give us the ability to begin to catch up on some of those deficit numbers.

The problem is that that body is spending at a rate of 12 percent great-

er and so, therefore, despite the additional revenues, we are spending at the greater rate than the increased revenues are coming in.

If we could get back to just having a spending rate at the rate of inflation we could cut into the deficit in a massive way based upon the economic growth that is taking place. And so it is important that we go beyond just freezing at the 1985 levels but take a look at a lot of programs in order to try to cut back so that our revenue growth can catch up with our spending levels.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Am I correct in my understanding that the gentleman in the well would be receptive to an amendment to his amendment from the chairman of the committee?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct. It is my understanding that the chairman of the committee is prepared to offer an amendment that would allow the committee to make adjustments within this particular number.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BOEHLERT and by unanimous consent Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] will offer such an amendment that will allow adjustments by the committee within this figure so that we can have the committee reflecting the priorities that we think are proper rather than to freeze again at the 1985 priority levels.

So I am prepared to accept that amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. If the gentleman will yield, it may I would like to commend the gentleman in the well for his willingness to accept that amendment because had he been reluctant to accept it I would have opposed vigorously the straight freeze amendment. I think we have got a responsibility here in the Congress to provide some leadership and I feel we are taking the easy way out every single time we just say "freeze."

Some programs are deserving of more funding. Some programs are deserving of a higher priority, and simply to establish a precedent under which we say to all of the agencies "Spend no more than you did last year, we are treating you all equal," they are not all equal. Some of them, and I happen to think the National Science Foundation is one of them, have a pressing need for more money because it is an investment in the future of America.

But I commend the gentleman in the well for working out a very satisfactory arrangement under the circumstances.

However, I must confess I do not like the circumstances. I think we in the Congress are weak-kneed, we are turning our back on our responsibility. We are not willing to establish priorities. We are saying freeze, and that is not good enough. I think the American people deserve something more than that.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman and I think part of my problem is the fact that I think we are weak-kneed on the spending side though, too, because some research I have been doing recently shows what we have done over the last 5 years is overspent our own budgets, our own budgets, by \$150 billion. If we do not find some way to begin to put a clamp on, we cannot depend upon the Budget Act to do it because we just waive the Budget Act, we violate it. The way we can begin to control is in the authorization process, because the authorizations stick. And we have to have something that sticks on this, and this is one way that you can begin to do it.

I would say to the gentleman I know that he is reflecting the kind of priority determination that the administration thought was important, that the science of this country has to go forward if we are to meet the technological future that this country needs to enjoy, if we are to improve trade and everything else. So the gentleman has taken a responsible position on that.

I think, though, from the standpoint of our committee, the realities of the House are at this point that what we need to do in this effort is to begin to freeze in some of these things that are high priority efforts so that in some of the other efforts a little later on we could also impose the same kind of freeze.

It is going to be interesting to see how people react to some of those.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I would like to put things into perspective. Consider this fact: at the very time we are talking about a budget for an agency which has primary responsibility for most nondefense research and development in America, an agency that is dealing with the future of America, which has a total budget request of \$1.6 billion, which is the total budget request for the National Science Foundation—now, get this—at this very hour, unless we in this body do something, on October 1 of this year the excise tax on cigarettes will be reduced from 16 cents to 8 cents a pack. That is a 50-percent reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BOEHLERT and by unanimous consent Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOEHLERT. You might say that is no big deal. But every one penny in excise tax in cigarettes brings in \$212 million. You multiply that by 8 and guess what? Miracles, miracles. That is more than the total budget request for an entire fiscal year, \$1.6 billion, for the National Science Foundation.

Now, I do not like to brag about it, but I am a smoker and I do it by choice. But it is mindboggling to me that we are arguing about nickels and dimes in an agency dealing with the future of America, and at the same time we are going to give a massive tax break to the tobacco industry.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, and the National Institutes of Health might want to talk to him about his choices.

Mr. PURSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I just want to appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New York. He has been working with us on a budget analysis of a freeze. But that is a bottom line minimum standard.

Obviously the spending habits of this Congress, including all of us over the years, have been rather on the high spending level, and the rate of spending has gone out of control. So it is a minimal effort of trying to get a freeze. Maybe it sounds good; it may be popular. We will be looking at each appropriation and authorization bill as they come along.

But I like science and technology and I like the National Science Foundation. My big university, the University of Michigan, is a recipient of funds from this committee.

But the President in briefing many of us on our budget freeze proposal thinks that that is the right strategy for the country at this time to get our fiscal house in order. And every university and every recipient from this committee realizes that if it is fair, if the Defense Department is treated the same as NSF, and UDAG, and revenue sharing, and all of the other programs, they could live with that kind of a strategy in terms of good public policy for this Nation to eliminate the deficit.

And let us not lose sight of that national deficit. That is an albatross around this Nation and around this country.

Mr. LUJAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, the ranking minority member on the committee.

Mr. LUJAN. I think the National Science Foundation can get along as well with \$1.5 billion as it can with \$1.6 billion. I do not think that that is a big cut in any agency.

However, having been around here for these last 17 years I just wonder sometimes about what motives there are, you know, other than balancing the budget which we all support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. LUJAN and by unanimous consent Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUJAN. And is it the intention of the proponents of these amendments that are offered on every bill or will be offered on every bill, and I will tell the gentleman that probably with the exception of Defense I will support all of the other freezes, but are we talking when we move down the line and it turns out that the 1985 level is higher than the President's proposal, is the gentleman thinking of taking the lower of the two, whatever it may be?

I will also ask the gentleman from Michigan that same question.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has raised that point here earlier, and my intention I think would be that when the President has come in at lower levels, then at that point we need to have an amendment out here to reflect those lower levels, because that is how we will really begin to control this process and that would certainly be this gentleman's intent, to take the lower of the two, the 1985 authorization or the President's request, and come to the floor with the lower of the two so that we begin to get a real adjustment in budget priorities.

Mr. LUJAN. If the gentleman would yield further, I would like to ask that same question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL]. I would ask the gentleman that question also because he is one of the ones that is bringing this subject up all of the time, for which I admire him, I might say.

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman. I have been here a number of years, not as long as the gentleman from New Mexico, I might say, but I think serving on the Appropriations Committee those are unusual cases when you are below the 1985 level in respect to individual spending pro-

grams in this Nation. So I think the gentleman is right. We ought to take a look at those on a case-by-case basis.

You are suggesting already that we make an exception in the area of the defense budget in your case, and this is you personally, and I respect that. But if each of us begins to make exceptions to reduce spending and try to get some fairness principle, whether it is a freeze or some percentage of growth rate, or limited emplacement at 4 percent, some particular principle of budgeting, unless we can do that we are not going to address this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. LUJAN and by unanimous consent Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

□ 1340

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is an open question. Let us look at the bills as they come before us. Some are lower, fine, but you are not going to find many examples in a trillion dollar budget in which those budget levels are lower.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. This is what concerns me. There are always some kinds of different motives. My particular budget that I like, for example, is in a different category from that one.

I am trying to kind of nail down: Are we going to generally go for the lower figure whether it is the 1985 level or the President's level? That is what I would support, I will tell the gentleman.

I would like to ask the gentleman the same question: Is he looking to offer amendments that would either be the 1985 level or the President's recommendation level, whichever is the lower.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the budgetary expense and principles are consistent across the board because it applies the fairness doctrine.

I would be open, and I think our group and others who are working on behalf of—and I am a task force chairman of a larger group—that we would be willing to look at those on a case-by-case basis.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. WALGREN and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me and I appreciate his approach to this. I notice in his statement that he says it apparently is the will of the House that we move to these levels.

I just want to be on record to try to raise recognition of the special nature of this budget, and I believe that in many instances the gentleman in the well would agree that reductions in this area do "cut off our nose to spite our face."

We will lose some substantial effort in this area, and I do not think we should kid ourselves that we are not. And when we go to the amendment as will be proposed by the chairman of the full committee [Mr. FUQUA], we will lose \$10 million in the engineering directorate.

Now that \$10 million is in an area of a very small investment, an area that is moving very fast; an area that my part of the country, particularly, can appreciate because it is our failure to keep up with manufacturing engineering particularly that has led to the demise of the steel industry, and a great deal of loss for our country also.

We will lose some \$25 million in the mathematics and physical sciences area.

Now those who would like on a case-by-case basis to treat defense with a little bit of extra effort, given the challenges around the world, would want to support that \$25 million.

You cannot look back in history and appreciate the role that theoretical physicists and theoretical mathematics played in the development of the atom bomb in World War II, knowing that we were just lucky, and turn our backs on an administration recommendation for \$25 million in that area. But we are by going forward in this way.

The same thing is true in the area of behavioral social sciences where we are at a critical mass in that period, in that area; they have suffered more than their share of cuts in the past. We will lose some \$12 million of research effort in this area where many students are turning away because of lack of support.

So we are going to lose something of real value. I hope we can agree on a fundamental approach, such as a freeze, which would then allow us to all join together and accomplish the goals of the gentleman in the well.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: In lieu of the matter insert:

In section 2 of the committee amendment, strike "\$372,170,000" and insert "\$359,483,000"; strike "\$272,050,000" and insert "\$259,260,000"; strike "\$170,070,000" and insert "\$160,070,000"; strike "\$428,970,000" and insert "\$404,377,000"; strike "\$38,360,000" and insert "\$37,770,000"; strike "\$69,900,000" and insert "\$72,230,000"; strike "\$82,000,000" and insert "\$50,550,000"; and strike "\$120,100,000" and insert "\$110,830,000."

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment. While the intent of the amendment, which is to reduce the fiscal year 1986 authorization to the fiscal year 1985 appropriation level, congressional and committee directions and priorities would be lost without my amendment. An amendment to reduce to the 1985 freeze level is more appropriate if legislative directives were given for the specific line items or the research and other activities provided for in the authorizing legislation.

The Science and Technology Committee has carefully reviewed the budget request and heard testimony from numerous witnesses in eight hearings, beginning in April 1984. The gentleman's amendment, while well intentioned does not preserve the research priorities and initiatives that are the products of directed and careful work by the Congress and by the committee.

The substitute amendment I offer to the gentleman's amendment is designed to do just that. It would reduce the budget authorization to last year's appropriation level—the freeze level as some prefer to call it, but with the best sense of priorities and purposes that we can fashion.

I believe the committee is in a position to offer guidance for each budget activity. The priorities that would be maintained by my amendment include the continuation of four national centers for advanced scientific computing, as well as the six engineering research centers selected several weeks ago by the National Science Foundation. Other priorities include basic research and associated instrumentation and facilities for mathematical, physical, biological, behavior, astronomical, atomspheric, Earth, and ocean sciences.

I believe the administration's fiscal year 1986 request and the Science Committee's bill are in the best interest of society and necessary to maintain U.S. competitiveness in basic research. However, given the concern over the deficit, I appreciate the need to reduce the bill reported by the Science and Technology Committee to the fiscal year 1985 appropriation level.

The NSF has five major areas of research emphasis, and a separate program for science and engineering education. My amendment preserves the fiscal year 1986 levels in H.R. 1210 for two of the areas, including advanced scientific computing; as well as retaining new obligatory authority for Science and engineering education. My amendment reduces authorization levels for three research areas below the H.R. 1210 level, but still allows for a 2- to 3-percent increase above the fiscal year 1985 appropriation level.

In the case of engineering, my amendment reduces the level in H.R. 1210 by \$10 million which still maintains the engineering activity at \$10 million above the fiscal year 1985 appropriation. This reduction may delay the planned establishment of additional engineering research centers in fiscal year 1986, but it will provide adequate funds to continue the six engineering research centers established in 1985. The bottom line is the same as the Walker amendment.

If at a later date, the Budget Committee allocates funds for the science category above the amounts authorized for NSF in my amendment, I would support consideration of a supplemental appropriation to restore the NSF budget to the administration's request for fiscal year 1986 and H.R. 1210.

I urge that the substitute amendment be agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee yield to me?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate the chairman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the approach the chairman is taking and comment on it because I think it is better for the committee, which is responsible for the funding, to make the decisions as to where the funding should go than to do it across the board.

But I would ask the question in the science and education, education directorate, where you have \$51 million, is it the intention or the understanding of the chairman that the \$31.5 million which is a carryover from 1985 for which there is a deferral pending, that that deferral would be approved so we would not have a programming change in that directorate?

Mr. FUQUA. The carryover funding would be included or could be carried over and would not be reduced.

Mr. GREGG. So there would be no reduction in the programming of that directorate.

Mr. FUQUA. That is correct.

Mr. GREGG. Of the \$51 million.

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I had indicated to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], as the author of the original amendment, I am certainly prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment. I think it is a very valuable addition to the amendment that I put forth.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to congratulate the gentleman and support his amendment. I think we do a better job of doing it the way the chairman has proposed, not that it is a bad idea what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is doing; but we take into consideration the additional effort, super computer centers, engineering centers, those sorts of things.

I would like to ask the gentleman, because I was out when he was discussing it earlier, but there is no change at all in the wording such as, for example, the closing of Sacramento Peak, that they could not move ahead?

Mr. FUQUA. Absolutely. All we are changing is the basic numbers to conform to the overall number that would total the amount that was appropriated in fiscal year 1985.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman and support his amendment.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would the good chairman from Florida indicate and clarify the actual dollars going back to 1985 that we would be saving by virtue of his amendment plus the Walker amendment?

Mr. FUQUA. It would reduce it back to \$1.502 billion.

Mr. PURSELL. It would be a saving of how many dollars?

Mr. FUQUA. Approximately \$100 million.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support both the Walker amendment and the committee substitute. I am very pleased to see the growing support in the House for the concept that was initially put forward by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], and myself, in the amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization. The practice of freezing spending at fiscal year 1985 levels is an important first step in dealing with the budget deficit.

□ 1350

I think a freeze is something we can implement now. It is equally important that the authorizing committees play the critical role in setting forth the priorities within available funds, and that is why I think that the committee substitute is particularly appropriate.

I hope that the message being sent by our votes on these freeze amendments will cause authorizing committees to take the lead by reporting to the floor bills at fiscal year 1985 spending level.

Unless we are willing to stick to fiscal year 1985 spending levels, I do not think we can make any reasonable start on fighting the budget deficit.

Some questions were raised about whether or not those of us who have been offering this kind of an amendment are committed to offering the lower of the President's level or the 1985 spending level.

Speaking just for this Member, I believe that a freeze at fiscal year 1985 spending levels is essentially the limit of what we can expect to accomplish through the authorizing process. Its case-by-case nature precludes the kind of balancing process that requires the input of the Budget Committee.

We have taken the step of freezing individual authorizations because our alternatives were so limited. We do not yet have a budget resolution. Because of that, decisions about the merits of cuts below the freeze level or increases above it have not been made.

Although a freeze at fiscal year 1985 appropriations level will not solve our deficit problem, our vote 2 weeks ago to freeze the NASA budget was significant. It demonstrated to the Committee on the Budget that there is general support for a freeze. A vote in favor of this amendment should wipe out any doubt about our resolve.

Obviously, there are places beyond what we are freezing where we may be able to save additional money. Now, the Budget Committee ought to be in a position to bring us both a budget resolution and a process through amendment so that the House can work its will on where perhaps we would spend more or where we would spend less.

Mr. LUJAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Am I to understand from that that if a bill comes in here at the President's figures, that might be less than 1985, is the gentleman going to seek an increase to the 1985 level?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. No; that is not what I was stating.

If the committee's judgment is that the President's level is the appropriate one, I am certainly not committed to raising spending to the 1985 level. However, if a committee comes in at the 1985 level and the President has proposed a lower level, I do not think we automatically should support going to the President's proposed spending level.

There are, I am sure, areas where all of us believe we could spend less than the 1985 level, and of course there are places where all of us could find to spend more than the 1985 level.

My view is, you should not spend more than the 1985 level unless you find the money to pay for the increase; either with cuts somewhere else, or by increases in revenue.

Only the budget process can provide that overall framework. What we are doing here in the authorization process is for those things that are coming to us before there is a budget; we are setting the precedent that we will spend more money until it is paid for, and by definition, it is not paid for at the point of the decision on these authorizations.

Mr. LUJAN. If the gentleman would yield further, is it then what I gather from the gentleman, is that if someone comes in with a 1985 level that is higher than the President's level, then the gentleman does not look at that as a priority for balancing the budget, only if it happens that the President proposed more than the 1985 level? Is that the understanding?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I think it is a priority to take the steps that we reasonably can take to do something about the budget deficit, and one on which I think there can be broad agreement is that we cannot spend more than the 1985 level unless we have found the funds to take care of the increased spending.

In fact, we have to do more than that, and that has been adequately and appropriately addressed. We have to start with what is possible. If we end the debate with the statement that "We're going to spend more here now because sometime down the road, we'll save some money," that is not going to work. That is what the budget process ought to bring to us, and I hope within the next month we are going to be on the floor here with the budget resolution, and we can have the debate about what areas of



the budget we will seek to reduce below the 1985 level.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. LUJAN. If the gentleman would continue to yield, would it be a good premise to start with to say the 1985 level or the President's level, whichever lower? Might that be some kind of additional premise?

Would it be a logical premise to proceed from that, whichever is lower, the 1985 level or the Presidential request level, whichever one of those two is the lower of the figures; because that really will help us lower the deficit.

Would it be logical to proceed on the basis that whichever of the two is lower, that is the one we should support? I want to help the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I understand.

Mr. LUJAN. I am with him on balancing the budget, on reducing it to the 1985 level, but I am asking the gentleman if he would not agree that if we are really serious about it, then let us take the lower of the two.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. First of all, I appreciate that the gentleman is trying to help, and I think we are both serious about the budget deficit. I would hope all Americans would be serious about it, because it is a serious problem. It is not a partisan issue. It is a serious American issue that we ought to deal with.

However, I do not agree with the gentleman that that is automatically the way to proceed. Frankly, I do not agree with some of the President's reductions, nor some of the President's increases, but what I do believe is that through our process of setting priorities in the past, we came to rest on the 1985 levels.

There was a considered judgement over a number of years to bring us to certain relative levels of spending. It is not perfect, but it reflects a kind of consensus: The House, the Senate and the President have agreed on the 1985 spending levels.

A place to start is to say we are not going to spend more than that until we make a considered judgment to find a way to pay for it. It is that broad principle that we can agree on most easily; it is not the end of the budget deficit solution, but it is a beginning.

There is a danger of breaking down that consensus if your premise were to be accepted. On a case-by-case basis, there may be a reasons to go below 1985 levels, but I cannot agree to a general rule that because the President has suggested that we do so, that we make that our operating premise. I am afraid I could not agree with that and I think many Members who agree on the freeze could not agree with that.

Mr. LUJAN. If the gentleman will yield to me, I just bring that up because my priority, beyond funding any particular agency of the Government is to balance the budget, and I am just looking for the lowest figure that we can spend.

Mr. WALGREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, that question will come up tomorrow, and as you know, tomorrow we will have the National Bureau of Standards budget, and the gentleman will have the alternative to abandon things like the Center for Fire Research in the Bureau in order to go to the lower number that the President has recommended.

Now, knowing the gentleman from New Mexico, I know that he has a highest priority on things like the Center for Fire Research. It certainly has contributed life-saving technology and promises cost-saving technology in the future, but that budget is so structured that we will have to abandon that.

I come back to the feeling that the question is, to what degree are we going to cut off our nose to spite our face in some of these reductions? And we may be able to agree on a freeze, and that is a possible starting point, but it also involves a certain amount of sacrifice, and I hope that we can minimize the losses.

I wanted to emphasize one other point, Mr. Chairman, a good point in the amendment as proposed by the chairman of the full committee, and that is the maintenance because the committee has restructured this and been involved in the restructuring; the maintenance of the supercomputer center effort within the university community.

We have Nobel Prizewinners, as the ranking minority member, Mr. BOEHLERT, knows, who have less access to supercomputers than graduate students in Europe. We maintain that level in this amendment that is being offered as a substitute. That is one of the—that is the least we should do, and the amendment is recommendable on the basis of that alone, I think.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for his contribution on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, it ought to be underscored that even a freeze imposes sacrifices. This budget deficit problem is not going to go away easily or for free. We are not talking about a matter where there are allegations of waste. We are talking about the tough choices that we have to make to resolve our fiscal crisis. I think the freeze is a good place to start.

□ 1400

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss in the context of this amendment, which I support, the future possibilities. This particular level, which will be successful here today, to bring it back to 1985 levels, is parallel to the amendment that was passed to the NASA authorization bill that we had on the floor some 2 weeks ago in which it was brought back to fiscal year 1985 spending levels.

These amendments are predicated on the fact that we will, in fact, be successful in an across-the-board freeze, which the Senate is considering a version thereof, not a pure freeze. It may well be that this particular House will have forthcoming out of the Budget Committee a true across-the-board freeze, or it may be, if they do not, that some such substitute budget might be offered by Members, such as myself, akin to one that was offered last year by myself and my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MacKAY], which, by the way, only received 108 votes.

The fact is that whether or not an across-the-board freeze is successful is going to be determined by some tough, hard, unpopular votes in the future.

Now, should the across-the-board freeze not prevail, then it is my intention, as chairman of the Space Subcommittee, and I would assume people handling the budgets of the National Science Foundation, to come back and make the plea that it ought to be at our committee-recommended level; in other words, these agencies dealing with science and technology, if other agencies of Government are not going to be bound by an across-the-board freeze, then these are the agencies that least should be held down to the previous year's spending levels.

Now, why do I say that? And I will conclude with this. I say that because of a revelation that has just come out, out of the Space Program research, a new laser that is being developed at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory that, because it was developed for the Space Program, it has an application we think that it might render mute bypass surgery, that you could use that laser to go in and clean out the arteries that otherwise we have to do bypass surgery for now.

Or I am talking about microminaturization that came out of the Space Program, transferring that technology to medicine today, and at Johns Hopkins right now they are about to implant a miniaturized computer in a human that will release, according to its computerized program, certain amounts of drugs, depending on the body's condition, that could cure those particular kinds of diseases.

My bottom line, in sharing these comments with you today, is that research out of science and technology is the future of America. These areas ought to sacrifice, as everyone, if in fact everyone does, in an across-the-board freeze. But if that unravels, then we need to go back and look out for the future of the United States.

I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and then I will yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for his statement, because I think he makes an excellent point. I think, to some extent, the Science and Technology Committee is getting penalized and science programs are getting penalized in this process for having done our work efficiently and having gotten to the floor first in the 1986 year. If in fact it worked out the way the gentleman's scenario says, that when we get to other votes later on we are not willing to maintain this position, then I think we ought to go back and reexamine the priorities. As it is right now, the record that we are making is that we are willing to go along with the freeze. I think we ought to continue to move in that direction and also come in at the President's lower levels, wherever that is appropriate, until that point when the House shows it is not willing to do that across the board, and then we ought to go back and examine just what the priorities of this country really should be.

So the gentleman's statement I think is very worthwhile, and I appreciate what he has had to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. NELSON of Florida was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN].

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I had not sought additional recognition from the gentleman because, basically, I was going to say what the gentleman from Pennsylvania did, and that is that we were the efficient committees, if you want to put it that way, and we brought our bills onto the floor, and we are the beginning ones. Not that I objected to it, not that I object to the freeze, not that I object to the lower level of spending, but I hope that it keeps on, what has happened in the bills we have brought to the floor continues to happen with other legislation.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 407, noes 4, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

## AYES—407

Addabbo	Conyers	Gradison
Akaka	Cooper	Gray (IL)
Alexander	Coughlin	Gray (PA)
Anderson	Courter	Green
Andrews	Coyne	Gregg
Annunzio	Craig	Guarini
Anthony	Crane	Gunderson
Applegate	Crockett	Hall (OH)
Archer	Daniel	Hall, Ralph
Armey	Dannemeyer	Hall, Sam
Atkins	Darden	Hamilton
AuCoin	Daschle	Hammerschmidt
Badham	Daub	Hansen
Barnard	Davis	Hartnett
Barnes	de la Garza	Hatcher
Bartlett	DeLay	Hawkins
Barton	Dellums	Hayes
Bateman	Derrick	Hefner
Bates	DeWine	Heftel
Bedell	Dickinson	Hendon
Bellenson	Dicks	Henry
Bennett	DioGuardi	Hertel
Bentley	Dixon	Hiler
Bereuter	Donnelly	Hillis
Berman	Dornan (CA)	Holt
Bevill	Dowdy	Hopkins
Blaggi	Downey	Horton
Blirakis	Dreier	Howard
Billey	Duncan	Hoyer
Boehlert	Durbin	Hubbard
Boggs	Dwyer	Huckaby
Boland	Dymally	Hughes
Boner (TN)	Dyson	Hunter
Bonior (MI)	Eckert (NY)	Hutto
Bonker	Edgar	Hyde
Borski	Edwards (CA)	Ireland
Bosco	Edwards (OK)	Jacobs
Boucher	Emerson	Jeffords
Boulter	English	Jenkins
Boxer	Erdreich	Johnson
Breaux	Evans (IA)	Jones (OK)
Brooks	Evans (IL)	Jones (TN)
Broomfield	Fascell	Kanjorski
Brown (CA)	Fawell	Kaptur
Brown (CO)	Fazio	Kasich
Broyhill	Feighan	Kemp
Bruce	Fiedler	Kennelly
Bryant	Fields	Kildee
Burton (CA)	Fish	Kindness
Burton (IN)	Flippo	Kolbe
Byron	Florio	Kolter
Callahan	Ford (TN)	Kostmayer
Campbell	Fowler	Kramer
Carney	Frank	LaFalce
Carper	Franklin	Lagomarsino
Carr	Frenzel	Lantos
Chandler	Frost	Latta
Chappell	Fuqua	Leach (IA)
Chapple	Gallo	Leath (TX)
Cheney	Garcla	Lehman (CA)
Clay	Gaydos	Lehman (FL)
Clinger	Gejdenson	Leland
Costs	Gekas	Lent
Cobey	Gephardt	Levin (MI)
Coble	Gibbons	Levine (CA)
Coelho	Gilman	Lewis (CA)
Coleman (MO)	Gingrich	Lewis (FL)
Coleman (TX)	Glickman	Lightfoot
Collins	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Combest	Goodling	Livingston
Conte	Gordon	Loeffler

Long  
Lott  
Lowery (CA)  
Lowry (WA)  
Lujan  
Lukens  
Lundine  
Lungren  
Mack  
MacKay  
Madigan  
Manton  
Markley  
Marlenee  
Martin (IL)  
Martin (NY)  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
Mazzoli  
McCain  
McCandless  
McCollum  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McEwen  
McGrath  
McHugh  
McKernan  
McKinney  
McMillan  
Meyers  
Mica  
Michel  
Mikulski  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WA)  
Mineta  
Mitchell  
Moakley  
Mollinari  
Mollohan  
Monson  
Montgomery  
Moody  
Moore  
Moorhead  
Morrison (CT)  
Morrison (WA)  
Mrázek  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Myers  
Natcher  
Neal  
Nelson  
Nichols  
Nielsen  
Nowak  
O'Brien  
Oaker  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olin

Ortiz  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Panetta  
Parris  
Pashayan  
Pease  
Penny  
Perkins  
Petri  
Pickle  
Porter  
Price  
Pursell  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Ray  
Regula  
Reid  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Robinson  
Rodino  
Roe  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland (CT)  
Rowland (GA)  
Roybal  
Rudd  
Russo  
Sabo  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Scheuer  
Schneider  
Schroeder  
Schuette  
Schulze  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shelby  
Shumway  
Shuster  
Sikorski  
Siljander  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skeltan  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NE)

## NOES—4

Early  
Kastenmeier  
St Germain  
Williams

## NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Ford (MI)	Stark
Aspin	Grothberg	Sweeney
Bustamante	Jones (NC)	Towns
Dingell	Kleczka	Trafcant
Dorgan (ND)	Lloyd	Wilson
Eckart (OH)	Pepper	Young (FL)
Foglietta	Savage	
Foley	Seiberling	

□ 1420

Mr. WILLIAMS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. LOEFFLER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 2?



If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

Sec. 3. Of the funds authorized to be appropriated in section 2, no funds shall be expended towards closure of a National facility without appropriate scientific review, including review by the National Science Foundation's appropriate advisory committee or committees and the National Science Board.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute bill be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point past section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Sec. 4. Appropriations made under the authority provided in sections 2 and 6 shall remain available for obligation for periods specified in the Acts making the appropriations.

Sec. 5. From the appropriations made under the authorizations provided in this Act, not more than \$3,500 may be used for official consultation, representation, or other extraordinary expenses at the discretion of the Director of the Foundation. His determination will be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

Sec. 6. Besides the sums authorized by section 2, not more than \$1,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1986 for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States, to be drawn from foreign currencies that the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

Sec. 7. (a) Funds may be transferred among the categories listed in section 2(a), so long as the net funds transferred to or from any category do not exceed 20 percent of the amount authorized for that category in section 2.

(b) In addition, the Director of the Foundation may propose transfers to or from any category in section 2; but an explanation of any such proposed transfer must be transmitted in writing to the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate authorizing committees of the House and Senate, and the proposed transfer may be made only when 30 calendar days have passed after the transmission of such written explanation.

Sec. 8. The National Science Foundation is authorized to design, establish, and maintain a data collection and analysis capability in the Foundation for the purpose of identifying and assessing the research facilities needs of universities. The needs of universities, by major field of science and engineering, for construction and modernization of research laboratories, including fixed equipment and major research equipment, shall be documented. University expenditures for the construction and modernization of research facilities, the sources of funds, and other appropriate data shall be collected and analyzed. The Foundation, in conjunction with other appropriate Federal agen-

cies, shall conduct the necessary surveys every 2 years and report the results to the Congress. The first report shall be submitted to the Congress by September 1, 1986.

Sec. 9. (a) Section 6 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a)" after "Sec. 6."; and

(2) by striking out subsection (b).

(b) Section 14(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "the Director, the Deputy Director, nor any Assistant Director" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Director nor the Deputy Director"; and

(2) by striking out "the Director, the Deputy Director, or any Assistant Director" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Director or the Deputy Director".

(c) Section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "Assistant Directors, National Science Foundation (4)."

Sec. 10. (a) Section 4(e) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "by registered mail or certified mail mailed to his last known address of record" in the last sentence.

(b) Section 5(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Director may make contracts, grants, and other arrangements pursuant to section 11(c) only with the prior approval of the Board or under authority delegated by the Board, and subject to such conditions as the Board may impose. Any delegation of authority or imposition of conditions under the preceding sentence shall be effective only for such period of time, not exceeding two years, as the Board may specify, and shall be promptly published in the Federal Register and reported to the appropriate authorizing committees of the Congress. On October 1 of each odd-numbered year the Board shall submit to the Congress a concise report which explains and justifies any actions taken by the Board under this subsection to delegate its authority or impose conditions within the preceding two years."

(c) Section 12 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a)" after "Sec. 12."; and

(2) by striking out subsection (b).

(d) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 9 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Each special commission established under section 4(h) shall be appointed by the Board and shall consist of such members as the Board considers appropriate.

"(b) Special commissions may be established to study and make recommendations to the Foundation on issues relating to research and education in science and engineering."

(e)(1) Section 14 of such Act, as amended by section 9(b) of this Act, is further amended—

(A) by striking out subsection (b);

(B) by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsections (b) through (h), respectively; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Information supplied to the Foundation or a contractor of the Foundation by an industrial or commercial organization in survey forms, questionnaires, or similar instruments for the purposes of subsection (a)(5) or (a)(6) of section 3 may not be disclosed to the public unless such information has been transformed into statistical or aggregate formats that do not allow the identification of the supplier. The names of organizations supplying such information may not be disclosed to the public."

(2) Sections 3(b) and 15(b)(1) of such Act are each amended by striking out "14(g)" and inserting in lieu thereof "14(f)".

(f) Section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1978 (Public Law 95-99), is repealed.

(g) Section 6(a) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1976 (Public Law 94-86) is amended—

(1) by striking out "not to exceed \$50,000 per year for a period not to exceed three years" in the last sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The National Science Board will periodically establish the amounts and terms of such grants under this section."

(h) Section 6 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1978 (Public Law 95-99), is repealed; and sections 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of such Act are redesignated as sections 6 through 12, respectively.

(i) Section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1980 (Public Law 96-44; 42 U.S.C. 1882) is amended by inserting "and the National Science Board" after "the Director of the National Science Foundation".

Sec. 11. (a) The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 through 1875) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1862(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "engineering,";

(B) by inserting after "other sciences," the following: "and to initiate and support research fundamental to the engineering process and programs to strengthen engineering research potential and engineering programs at all levels in the various fields of engineering,"; and

(C) by striking out "such scientific and educational activities" and inserting in lieu thereof "such scientific, engineering, and educational activities".

(2) Section 3(a)(3) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific"; and

(B) by inserting "and engineers" after "scientists".

(3) Section 3(a)(4) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific"; and

(B) by inserting "and engineering" after "sciences".

(4) Section 3(a)(5) is amended by inserting "and fields of engineering" after "sciences".

(5) Section 3(a)(6) is amended by striking out "technical" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(6) Section 3(a)(7) is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific".

(7) Section 3(b) is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears.

(8) Section 3(c) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" in the first sentence; and

(B) by inserting "and engineering research" after "applied scientific research" in the second sentence.

(9) Section 3(d) is amended by striking out "basic research and education in the sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "research and education in science and engineering".

(10) Section 3(e) is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "sciences".

(11) Section 4(c) (42 U.S.C. 1863(c)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" in clause (3) of the first sentence;

(B) by inserting "and engineers" after "scientists" in the second sentence; and

(C) by inserting "the National Academy of Engineering," after "National Academy of Sciences," and inserting "engineering," after "scientific," in the third sentence.

(12) The first sentence of section 10 (42 U.S.C. 1869) is amended by striking out "scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, social, and other sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "study and research in the sciences or in engineering".

(13) Section 11 (42 U.S.C. 1870) is amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears in subsections (c) and (d);

(B) by striking out "technical" and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering" in subsection (g); and

(C) by striking out "scientific value" and inserting in lieu thereof "scientific or engineering value" in subsection (g).

(14) Section 12 (42 U.S.C. 1871), as amended by section 10(c) of this Act, is further amended by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific".

(15) Section 13(a) (42 U.S.C. 1872(a)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears in the first two sentences;

(B) by inserting "or engineers" after "scientists"; and

(C) by striking out "scientific study or scientific work" and inserting in lieu thereof "study and research in the sciences or in engineering".

(16) Section 13(b) is amended by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific".

(17) Section 14 (42 U.S.C. 1873), as amended by sections 9(b) and 10(e) of this Act, is further amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears in subsection (e); and

(B) by striking out "technical" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(18) Section 15(b) (42 U.S.C. 1874(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "technical" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering"; and

(B) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" in paragraph (2).

(b) Section 2(b) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1869a, Public Law 94-86) is amended by inserting "or engineering" after "science" each place it appears.

(c) Part B of the National Science Foundation Authorization and Science and Technology Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885 to 1885d, Public Law 96-516) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 31 is amended by striking out "Technology" and inserting in lieu thereof "Engineering".

(2) Section 32(a) (42 U.S.C. 1885(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "technology" and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering"; and

(B) by striking out "scientific talent and technical skills" and inserting in lieu thereof "scientific and engineering talents and skills".

(3) The first sentence of section 32(b) (42 U.S.C. 1885(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "skills in science and mathematics" and inserting in lieu thereof "skills in science, engineering, and mathematics";

(B) by striking out "technical" and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering";

(C) by striking out "scientific literacy" and inserting in lieu thereof "scientific and engineering literacy"; and

(D) by striking out "technology" and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(4) The second sentence of section 32(b) (42 U.S.C. 1885(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "highest quality science" and inserting in lieu thereof "highest quality science and engineering"; and

(B) by striking out "technology" and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(5) The third sentence of section 32(b) (42 U.S.C. 1885(b)) is amended by striking out "technology" and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(6) Section 33 (42 U.S.C. 1885a) is amended—

(A) by striking out "technology" and "technical" each place they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering";

(B) by inserting "engineering," after "science" in paragraph (2);

(C) by inserting "and engineers" after "scientists" each place it appears;

(D) by inserting "and engineering" after "science" in paragraph (10); and

(E) by striking out "science, engineering, and technology" in paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof "science and engineering".

(7) Section 34 (42 U.S.C. 1885b) is amended—

(A) by striking out "science education" and inserting in lieu thereof "science and engineering education"; and

(B) by striking out "technology" and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(8) Section 36 (42 U.S.C. 1885c) is amended—

(A) by striking out "TECHNOLOGY" in the heading and "Technology" and "technology" each place they appear, and inserting in lieu thereof "ENGINEERING", "Engineering", and "engineering", respectively; and

(B) by striking out "scientific engineering, professional, and technical" and inserting in lieu thereof "scientific, engineering, and professional".

(9) Section 37(b) (42 U.S.C. 1885d(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "technical" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering"; and

(B) by striking out "Technology" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "Engineering".

(10) The heading of such part B is amended by striking out "TECHNOLOGY" and inserting in lieu thereof "ENGINEERING".

SEC. 12. Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the Director of the National Science Foundation shall review the recommendations of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control and such other recommendations as may be included in the OMB report "Management of the United States Government—1986", and shall submit a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate Committee of the House and Senate on the implementation status of each such recommendation which affects the National Science Foundation and which is within the authority and control of the Director.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BEILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1210) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for related purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 129, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISINFORMATION NETWORK

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke on the "Network" of pro Sandinista lobbyist groups that are manipulating public opinion against the freedom fighters, the Democratic resistance forces in Nicaragua.

Today, I want to introduce to every American who has any concern about our future and our children's future part 2 of a Washington Times series entitled "Network" which exposes the leftwing disinformation systems. Part 2 of this series details and exposes the exploits of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs [COHA], a group which claims to be a human rights organization.

Never before have the insidious tentacles of Marxist influence reached into our everyday lives into the very pulpits we should depend on. The



Times article reveals this organization as nothing short of a left-wing foreign policy group masquerading as a human rights organization.

To quote the Times:

COHA has no concern for human rights, just concern for foreign policy. If they did, they would ask how many people are jailed by the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, but they don't.

No, Mr. Speaker, this group ignores the gross human rights violations by the Sandinistas.

I urge the American people who are concerned about the true motives of this organization to get the full story. Read the "Network" series.

LATIN COUNCIL CALLED BACKER OF LEFTISTS,  
NOT HUMAN RIGHTS  
(By John Holmes)

In the spiderweb that comprises "The Network" of left-wing organizations opposed to administration policies, the Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA) stands out as one of the better known.

COHA literature describes the organization as "a non-profit, tax-exempt independent research and information organization" founded "to promote the common interests of the hemisphere; raise the visibility and increase the importance of the inter-American relationship; and encourage the formulation of rational and constructive U.S. policies toward Latin America."

COHA is run by Larry Birns, a tireless one-man army who serves as the council's founder, director, manager, press secretary, congressional liaison, researcher and chief fundraiser. Mr. Birns, extremely visible in liberal circles, calls COHA "a human rights organization."

But some of those who have dealt with COHA don't see it quite that way.

COHA is not a human rights group. It is a left-wing foreign policy group that often masquerades as a human rights group," says Elliott Abrams, assistant secretary of state for human rights and humanitarian affairs.

"If you read what they've had to say through the years about human rights violations in Surinam, or Bishop's Grenada, or Cuba—worst of all, Cuba—you will see that they don't care about human rights in leftist or communist regimes," Mr. Abrams told The Times.

Mr. Abrams' duties bring him into contact with countless human rights organizations. He says there is a significant difference between COHA and such groups as the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), a group that shares COHA's political orientation and is an integral part of The Network. "WOLA has political prejudices just as we all do, but it makes a real effort to promote human rights progress," Mr. Abrams continued.

"So, while I disagree with WOLA, I work with them," he says. "But I will not have any contact with COHA and I do not permit members of the Bureau [of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs] to cooperate with them."

"COHA is not genuine in its stated beliefs in human rights. What it is in fact doing is promoting leftist regimes in Latin America," he said.

Bosco Matamoros, a representative of Nicaragua's anti-Sandinista FDN, agrees.

"They have no concern for human rights, just concern for foreign policy. If they did, they would have asked how many people

are jailed by the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, but they haven't," he says.

"They know completely the situation down there, but they don't take into account the voices or opinion of the Nicaraguan people. They take as fact whatever is stated by the Sandinistas," Mr. Matamoros said in an interview.

These criticisms are supported by a 1984 Heritage Foundation paper, entitled "The Left's Latin American Lobby."

"An analysis of [COHA's] publications reveals a pattern exaggerating the abuses of right-wing governments or movements, while understating the abuses of leftist regimes or guerrilla groups. This calls into question the integrity of COHA's sources and data that it marshals against the Reagan administration's policies in Central America," the Heritage report states.

"What [COHA's] critics are] upset about is that we do a great deal of accurate research," Mr. Birns counters.

To be sure, there are many who believe COHA's materials are accurate and well-presented. But critics contend that his publications are sometimes biased and have reflected Marxist Sandinista propaganda and disinformation themes.

A COHA press release dated Feb. 13, 1984, declared, "U.S. Helicopter Parts Sale to Guatemala Sure to Kill Indians and Worsen Refugee Flow to United States." And a headline on a release dated May 30, 1984, blared, "Guatemalan Military Dictatorship Set to Rig July Elections."

Two aspects of COHA's operations involve Capitol Hill and the press.

Mr. Birns calls COHA "a publishing mill." His council, he says, produces two to three press releases per week and numerous opinion pieces and reports. Some of these are incorporated by congressmen and their staff members into their own reports, speeches and letters, he says.

"We are a powerful force in the wings" of Congress, Mr. Birns admits.

Several liberal legislators, including Reps. Don Bonker, D-Wash., Robert Garcia, D-N.Y., and Sen. Tom Harkin, D-Ia., are listed as being on COHA's board of directors.

Last year COHA submitted numerous articles to these congressmen and others. As many as 100 of the articles to these congressmen were inserted in the Congressional Record, according to Mr. Birns.

But he denies that COHA engages in lobbying.

"We have no legislative people who go and chat up people on the Hill," he said. "It's pointless to try because many of the people up there know more than we do."

Indeed, aides to several senators and congressmen serving on such important committees as Foreign Relations and Intelligence report that they don't read COHA's releases and have never met with COHA lobbyists. Some say they've never even heard of COHA or Mr. Birns.

Still, says one intelligence analyst, "There are between 40 and 55 congressmen who would promote their material." And the attention of those legislators and their staffers is enough to make an impact on public opinion and perception, if not necessarily on policy or legislation, the analyst says.

COHA also is a powerful force in the media. It is there, more than anywhere else, that the organization has made its mark, according to observers. Of all the groups that comprise the left-leaning Latin American component of The Network, none appears to be more effective than COHA at planting its material in the press.

"We influence the mass public opinion via the press," Mr. Birns says. "We get stuff put in the local newspapers and the congressmen read those local papers."

Mr. Birns also regularly appears on programs ranging from radio's "The Larry King Show" to TV's "McNeil-Lehrer Report" and other network interviews. He also has been interviewed by television crews from Spain, Sweden, West Germany and other European nations.

But he appears to be most influential with a specific section of the foreign media, most notably the British Broadcasting Corporation (which has about 100 million listeners worldwide)—for whom he says he does as many as 50 interviews a year—and the Latin American press, which he says is a prime focus of COHA's efforts.

COHA brags in its literature that its "findings have been cited in the official publications of the U.S. government as well as in national and international publications such as Time, Newsweek, The Atlantic Monthly, The New Yorker, The New Statesman, Penthouse, Barron's and Macleans."

"On an almost daily basis, the results of COHA's work appear in the press in Latin America, the United States and Europe," the literature states.

The council also has been cited on numerous occasions in The New York Times, The Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the Christian Science Monitor, The Baltimore Sun, The Miami Herald, The Toronto Globe and Mail, the Manchester Guardian, the London Observer and the Times of London, among other newspapers.

"COHA is effective with the press," says the intelligence analyst. "The media is their main constituency."

Several analysts say they believe that COHA manipulates the media by submitting one-sided information.

"They'll get stuff put together for the BBC for broadcast on a Friday night, and people will pick it up in other countries on Saturday," one analyst explains. "It's a dead day, you're looking for a filler, and there it goes."

"They [COHA] have tremendous relations with the Latin America press, too," says a staffer with the conservative Council for Inter-American Security.

"Someone like a guy from the Venezuelan news service might take his press releases and send them back as news to Venezuela, to Costa Rica, to Honduras, wherever. So it has this duplicating effect. It gets sent down there as news, and very often it bounces back up here," the staffer says.

Many of COHA's detractors point to a 1980 incident as an example of the council's actions. Late that year, a so-called State Department "dissent paper" (a paper normally written by a foreign service officer to express his reservations over foreign policy) circulated widely throughout political, diplomatic and journalistic circles.

The paper was sharply critical of U.S. policy toward El Salvador, and charged that there had been a coverup of U.S. military involvement there. The "dissent paper," however, was later revealed to have been a forgery.

Mr. Birns claims that COHA wasn't involved in distributing the document. But he did issue a four-page press release, with three of the pages filled with single-spaced details from the supposed dissent paper. COHA did question the paper's authenticity in the body of the release.

"We had been told by the State Department that it didn't take the form of an au-

thentic dissent document, but I thought the reasoning in it was good enough to warrant the release," Mr. Birns now says.

At 55, Mr. Birns remains articulate and highly personable; even his critics admit that he's a master publicist. But he also remains an energetic opponent of Reagan policies in Latin America.

COHA operates out of a suit of offices—once occupied by the McGovern campaign—near Dupont Circle, with a staff of about 30 apparently dedicated young people and, according to Mr. Birns, an annual budget of about \$125,000. \* \* \*

Critics of COHA accuse the council of engaging in misleading practices to generate the illusion of respectability by association.

From time to time COHA has sent out invitations to conferences and seminars with a list of "invited panelists," many of whom are respected authorities from all bands of the political spectrum.

But Mr. Birns doesn't always contact these "panelists" to ask them to appear. Nevertheless, COHA seeks to capitalize on the drawing power of their names, the observers say.

COHA did just that last month with a conference on Central America co-sponsored with the Fund for New Priorities in America.

On the list of "invited panelists" were such dignitaries as syndicated columnist Robert Novak, Arnaud de Borchgrave, editor-in-chief of *The Washington Times*, and Ambassador Otto Reich, the State Department's coordinator for public policy on Latin America and the Caribbean.

Mr. Reich says he first heard of his inclusion on the list from a friend who had also been invited. Mr. Novak said he was told of his inclusion by a reporter.

"I was not consulted," says Mr. Reich. "If I'd known that [Mr. Birns] was going to put me on the list, I would have demanded that I be taken off."

Insists Mr. Novak, "They never asked me."

Mr. Birns looks shocked when told some feel this is deceptive or manipulative, and says "this is standard practice."

"I never said all those people were going to show up," he says.

"I just said on the invitations that they'd been invited. If you were invited to an event, wouldn't you like to know who else had been invited?"

The heat of the debate over COHA's actions is matched by the continuing controversy surrounding the council's founding and purpose.

Much of this controversy stems from an article inserted into the *Congressional Record* by the late Rep. Larry McDonald, D-Ga., on April 15, 1977.

In that article, Mr. McDonald wrote that Mr. Birns once described COHA's purpose as "to manipulate the sophisticated political and academic communities," a statement Mr. McDonald called "indicative not so much of candor as of Birns' arrogance and deep contempt for his targets."

Mr. McDonald also wrote that Mr. Birns was "an associate of Chilean Marxist-Leninist Orlando Letelier," who soon after his death was revealed to have been receiving covert Soviet money channeled through the Cuban intelligence service, the DGI.

COHA's "pro-Marxist-Leninist stance was evident from its initial press conference where Birns supported the Marxist Allende government of Chile, Cuba, the pro-Castro dictatorship in Panama, the left-leaning

governments of Mexico and Venezuela." Mr. McDonald wrote.

The 1984 Heritage Foundation report states that COHA "essentially was a by-product" of Mr. Birns's participation in a 1976 meeting in Mexico City of the International Commission of Inquiry into the Crimes of the Chilean Junta, a creation of the World Peace Council, a known Soviet front group.

"Much of that McDonald stuff was fabricated," Mr. Birns counters. "I never attended the Mexico deal. I saw Letelier once after the coup. And he never gave us any money. In fact, I gave him \$25 for some Chilean refugee program he was running."

The controversy over COHA's origins and purpose apparently had little effect on its dealings with the Carter administration, on which Mr. Birns says "our influence . . . was profound. He [President Carter] praised us by name."

Mr. Birns admits that "our influence with Reagan is minute. It's more and more difficult to communicate with [the Department of] State. The liberals in State and the CIA for that matter are closet liberals," he says. "But our influence on public opinion is great."

Tomorrow: Activities of the Washington Office on Latin America.

### PATRIOTS, NOT PARTISANS

(Mr. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I come today to talk of patriots not partisans. Two hundred years separate the lives of Thomas Jefferson and Robert Schuller. But no number of years can split the faith these two men have had in their country.

As we contemplate the challenges of reducing the Nation's debt I ask you to consider the following words of these two patriots.

Jefferson said that:

I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of our Government to the genuine principles of its Constitution; I mean an additional article, taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing.

And Robert Schuller in his new book, "The Power of Being Debt Free," published by Thomas Nelson Publishers says this:

Say yes to an idea if it will help people who are hurting now or in the future.

Isn't it time we say yes to the balanced budget tax limitation amendment.

Let me refer again to Reverend Schuller's book coauthored by Paul David Dunn.

Reverend Schuller's positive 10 commandments of possibility thinkers are one patriot's way of holding a lantern up so the rest of us can see the dangers of America's debt. I think we should clear our eyes of bias so that we can clearly see his points.

I have already quoted the first of the positive 10 commandments of pos-

sibility thinkers. Let's look at that and the nine others more closely.

A baby is born this year and it is strapped with thousands of dollars of Federal debt. Can you imagine how these babies soon to be adults will hurt if they must pay off that sort of debt before they even think about buying a car, a house, or a baby carriage for their own children. And we know that people are now hurting because of our yearly Federal deficits. How much longer can we stay healthy and vital when we have Federal debt of more than \$1.8 trillion and yearly deficits of more than \$160 billion.

Reverend Schuller's second commandment is "Say yes to an idea if it challenges and motivates self-discipline." We have forgotten the virtues of self-discipline. Somehow we value self-discipline for ourselves but not for Government. We can only spend what we have every month to feed, clothe and house our families. Business operators must balance their budgets too. Some 200 years ago what was good for the governed was good for the governors. That is no less true today.

The third positive commandment is that, "Say yes to an idea if it holds the prospect of contributing to peace, prosperity, and pride in the human family." We must change the role of the American people. We must not give them the job of paying off the interest on the principle. We should make clear the principle interest of the American people should be to spend their energies building better lives.

Reverend Schuller's fourth commandment is that, "Say yes to an idea if it will endow the great dreams of great dreamers." America was a great dream of great dreamers. We public servants of 1985 can not allow to let the dream die. And the people must not allow the myopic politicians to force our children to pay for our dreaming and they must endure nightmares.

"Say yes to an idea if it makes good financial sense." We are a government operating with a budget in name only. That's not good financial sense. By operating with a budget that must balance each year America could be paying its own way instead of paying for the present with the future. A free nation will not last long if its people are in servitude.

No. 6. "Say yes to an idea if it will bring beauty into the world." If the budget deficits continue we will be spending more of our money on interest on the debt not more on cleaning our cities, in repairing our roads, in building parks for our children.

No. 7. "Say yes to an idea if it contributes to a sense of a caring community." America has done more than just open its arms to people who yearned to breathe free. It has used its



position as the leader of the free world to reduce oppression elsewhere.

Reverend Schuller says that, "Say yes to an idea if it will contribute to the collective self-esteem of a person or a nation." Recession shocked America in the 1970's. Debt is more than shocking America in the 1980's. But recession was nothing compared to the debt crisis we now face. If we don't fight against our self-doubts America will never see its way clear of seeing a debt free society. And if America loses its self-esteem, its self-worth—then the world loses not only a friend but a needed leader.

"Say yes to an idea if it is a positive solution to a negative condition." Can you imagine any more negative condition than America's debt? Can you imagine any reason why America should not get rid of its debt.

And Reverend Schuller's 10th commandment says that, "Say yes to an idea if it challenges us to think bigger and have more faith"—\$1.8 trillion is a lot of money to think about paying. And ending yearly budget deficits of \$160 billion is a sizable challenge. It will take great vision to see the possibility of getting the job done and it will take a great deal of faith to do the job.

This public servant, rancher, citizen believes that America has 10 good reasons given to us by Reverend Schuller to support the balanced budget/tax limitation amendment. I commend Reverend Schuller and his coauthor Paul David Dunn for putting a light in the tower and making sure that it burns brightly for all to see.

It is time that America discard partisanship and embrace patriotism. If America does the light in the tower will never dim.

#### PRESIDENT REAGAN'S PLAN FOR CENTRAL AMERICA IS MISLEADING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening I heard President Reagan say that Belisario Betancur, the President of Colombia, supported his new initiative to provide aid to refugees in Central America. When confronted with the proposal in its entirety, which is after 60 days and no agreement is reached in Central America that military aid will continue to be supplied to the Reaganists, the guerrilla army attempting to overthrow the Sandinistas, Belisario Betancur denied having supported that proposal, stating that the proposal is no longer a peace plan but it is a preparation for war.

Mr. President, you have misled Belisario Betancur and you have misled the American people into believing that your plan is one for peace in Central America.

Over the last 3 years, an unprecedented military buildup has taken place and the unfortunate result of your policy is, Mr. President, that your military strategy has been a powerful reinforcement to the Sandinista government which you intend to overthrow.

I include the following article:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1985]  
COLOMBIAN OPPOSES U.S. AID TO NICARAGUAN REBELS

(By Joel Brinkley)

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, April 15.—The President of Colombia said today that he and other Latin American leaders were opposed to renewed United States military aid for rebels fighting the Nicaraguan Government.

Earlier this month the President, Belisario Betancur, told reporters in Washington that his reaction to President Reagan's plan on Nicaragua had been "very positive." But today Mr. Betancur said his response had been based on the plan's call for a cease-fire and negotiations.

He said President Reagan and Secretary of State George P. Shultz had not mentioned to him that the proposal also provided for renewed aid to the rebels, and he said he had not realized this was part of the plan until his return to Bogota.

Mr. Betancur, speaking in an interview here, said Mr. Reagan's recent call for Congress to approve \$14 million in aid to the rebels made that part of the President's plan "no longer a peace proposal, but a preparation for war."

In the last few days, several senior Reagan Administration officials have said that Mr. Betancur and other Latin American leaders supported Mr. Reagan's initiative, including a call for renewed aid to the rebels if a deadline for talks in Nicaragua is not met.

#### "FOREIGN INTERVENTION" OPPOSED

Mr. Betancur said today that he and other Latin American leaders "firmly believe that any foreign support to guerrilla groups, whatever the origin, is clearly in opposition to the prevailing doctrine in Latin America regarding foreign intervention in the internal affairs of our continent."

His view on foreign financing of Latin American conflicts, he said, is "outright rejection" of the idea.

He said he had discussed the matter in the last few days with heads of state of many Central and South American countries, and added, "I haven't spoken with any Latin American leader who feels differently."

Mr. Betancur also said he believed that "we are now very close to reaching a full agreement" in the Contadora peace negotiations for Central America, which have been under way for more than two years.

The remaining obstacles, he said, involve agreements on limiting foreign military maneuvers, bases and advisers. But he said that "we have made some headway on that," adding that "there may be one or another matter out of the whole agreement that the United States would not agree with."

In the 60-minute interview at the Presidential Palace here, Mr. Betancur said that while parts of Mr. Reagan's Nicaragua initiative were "positive and constructive," other

parts were in direct conflict with the goals of the Contadora discussions.

In what he called a "peace initiative" for Nicaragua, Mr. Reagan proposed a cease-fire and negotiations between the American-backed rebels and the Sandinista Government that would lead to new elections. Nicaragua immediately rejected the plan.

At the same time Mr. Reagan asked Congress to approve \$14 million in renewed aid for the rebels, saying the money would be used for nonmilitary purposes for 60 days. If the Nicaraguan Government does not agree to talk with the rebels by June 1, Mr. Reagan said, the aid would then be available to the rebels for weapons.

Mr. Betancur was in Washington on April 4, when the plan was announced, and he said today that Mr. Reagan and Mr. Shultz had given him only a partial briefing on it. In a meeting that morning, Mr. Betancur said, they told him that they planned to propose a cease-fire, negotiations and nonmilitary aid to the rebels—ideas that Mr. Betancur said he accepted with enthusiasm.

#### I DID NOT KNOW IT WAS TIED

But he said that when he left the White House, he "did not know it was tied to the \$14 million" in renewed aid to the rebels.

Mr. Shultz gave him a printed copy of the full plan as he left, Mr. Betancur said, but he did not have time to read it until much later.

That afternoon, Mr. Reagan appeared on national television and described his plan in detail. Mr. Betancur held a news conference in Washington at about the same time—he did not see Mr. Reagan's address, he said—and when he was asked what he thought of Mr. Reagan's plan, he said, "My reaction is very positive."

A few days later, Robert C. McFarlane, Mr. Reagan's national security adviser, told reporters that the leaders of the four Contadora countries—Colombia, Venezuela, Panama and Mexico—all had endorsed Mr. Reagan's plan, including the call for renewed military aid, although he said Mexico was "less effusive" than the others.

#### QUALIFIED SUPPORT

Today Mr. Betancur said, "I understand that Mr. McFarlane has interpreted my cautious remarks in which I stated that the proposal was, at least in part, constructive and positive, as a sort of blanket approval rather than qualified support."

If the Administration is trying to use his statements to gain renewed military aid for the rebels, Mr. Betancur added, "there would be a contradiction by whomever attempts to do so."

He said it would be "infinitely more constructive" if Mr. Reagan's proposal "made no mention of a 60-day time limit" for the end of nonmilitary aid, because that "is almost like an ultimatum."

Mr. Betancur said the first part of Mr. Reagan's plan, the call for a cease-fire, "is constructive and positive inasmuch as it delays the second part of the proposal, which is the onset of a military solution."

At a meeting in Panama last week, their first since last fall, officials from all four Contadora countries said their Governments had come to similar conclusions.

The Contadora group, named for the island off Panama where the first meeting was held, has been trying to fashion a peace plan for Central America since January 1983. The plan would encompass Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua.

## TALKS ARE SPECTACULAR SUCCESS

Mr. Betancur, who is widely viewed as the Contadora leader most actively involved in the negotiations, called the meeting last week "a spectacular success." After several months of inaction, problems that had been blocking the talks are now resolved, he said, adding that the negotiations now seem to be surrounded by "a state of grace."

An agreement was reached Friday on the establishment of a commission to monitor an accord being negotiated on reducing arms in the region. "This was the greatest obstacle," Mr. Betancur said today. "We are now very close to reaching an agreement."

SUPPORT OF HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 125

(Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Arthur Nicholson, Jr., was a dedicated and fine servant to his Nation. His career with the U.S. Army commenced in 1969 and was marked by numerous distinguished accomplishments.

Tragically, this patriot's service to our Nation was cut short when on March 24 Major Nicholson was brutally gunned down by a Soviet soldier while on duty in East Germany.

That action on the part of the Soviet Union was nothing short of barbaric.

There was absolutely no justification for the action which was taken by an agent of the Soviet military and I find the lack of any apology or acknowledgement of wrong-doing by that Government to be totally unacceptable.

Major Nicholson is gone, but the resolve and commitment of this Nation in preserving the peace lives on.

In his memory, a tree was planted at Fort Belvoir on April 3. At that ceremony, Karen Nicholson talked about her husband.

Her eloquent but simple words truly reflect well on Major Nicholson and they also demonstrate the grace and dignity which has been exhibited by Karen and the entire Nicholson family during this very traumatic time.

The Nicholsons reside in West Redding, CN, and I have the high honor of representing this fine family in Congress.

Mrs. NICHOLSON. Fort Belvoir is a very special place for this memorial. Not only because it is a beautiful post, but because it is close to Nick's colleagues, but also because it was here he attended OCS and he was commissioned by his father. It was also here that he was in charge of the unit on his first assignment. I feel close to Nick here because he loved the outdoors. I thank all of the people from around the world for their thoughts, letters and prayers.

To belong to the military is to belong to a very special family. Perhaps because we are so often away from our loved ones, a bond develops that you can find no where else. And that love and concern has opened many

doors for Jenny and me and has stood by me this week. I especially thank each and every member of the Mission family, who have given unselfishly of themselves to see that our lives have been made easier and all of our desires met. Nick is the most patriotic person I've ever known and that's why he made the military his life. He felt that each and every day he did something for his country, for his family and for everyone he knew. He devoted his life to understanding other people, especially the Soviets, in the hopes that through friendship and knowledge of each other he could contribute to world peace. He didn't want to die and we didn't want to lose him, but he would gladly lay down his life again for America.

□ 1230

## BUY AMERICAN URANIUM

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Federal Domestic Uranium Purchasers Act. This bill would require all Federal agencies, including the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense, to satisfy all future uranium requirements through the purchase of uranium that is mined, milled, and enriched within the United States by companies owned by U.S. citizens.

This "buy American" proposal has become necessary because of a long-term failure on the part of the Federal Government to act responsibly in seeing to it that this Nation has a strong domestic uranium mining and milling industry. Our national security and our energy independence are my primary concerns. In less than 4 years I have watched our domestic milling industry shrink by 75 percent to a dangerously low level. Only 6 of the 24 processing mills that were in operation in 1981 are still in operation today and most of them are practically standing idle. The adverse impact on uranium industry jobs is perhaps the worst it has ever been. Over 90 percent of the jobs have been lost and that means that more than 20,000 workers and all of their expertise and experience are gone. While I am deeply concerned about these men and women who are the brains and the backbone of this industry, I am alarmed about the long-term impacts on our defense capabilities as well as the commercial nuclear power industry.

Today, U.S. uranium production accounts for less than one-third of our 30 million pound U.S. annual requirement. What position will we find ourselves in if that production capability continues to plunge? The past 4 years have been a disaster and the next 4 years could mark the end of a viable domestic uranium mining and milling capability.

New Mexico contains about 41 percent of the uranium producible at a

reasonable cost in the United States. Four years ago, we had 38 production mines in the State. April 4 was the last day of operation for our last uranium mine. These mines cannot be restarted at the drop of a hat. When they are not in operation their drifts and cross-cuts begin to cave in. Some of them fill up with water. The end result is that a mine that is closed is lost and cannot be reopened without the expenditure of an inordinate amount of money. The pool of experienced labor is suffering a similar fate. Most of the 6,800 men and women who were employed at the beginning of this decade in New Mexico have moved on to other jobs in other areas. Another 100 miners ended their jobs in the section 23 mine. On June 1, 50 more lose their jobs and that will leave less than 200 people working in the entire uranium industry in our State. Our last mine is about to be closed and we are witnessing the extinction of uranium mining and milling in the State which contains 41 percent of the economically mined ore. To resume production will require a monumental expenditure of investment capital and the expensive training of new workers. The cost will be staggering and the time it could take may be dangerous to our security.

The Federal Domestic Uranium Purchasers Act is intended to solve some of these problems. While our mining and milling industry may not be able to compete directly with inexpensive foreign labor, extremely high grade ore and foreign government subsidies, it can provide this Nation with a uranium supply that is not subject to the whims of an unstable government or that will not become part of a foreign uranium cartel.

The Atomic Energy Act requires the Department of Energy to "assure the maintenance of a viable domestic uranium industry." What is "viable" and what is not has come to be the subject of dispute between the report writers at the Department and the industry. My bill does not redefine these terms or in any other way join in that dispute. Instead, I have taken an alternative course. If all Federal agencies are required to purchase domestically produced and enriched uranium, a domestic mining and milling industry will continue to exist to supply at least that minimum level of demand. Some of our mines and mills will be saved from extinction and some of our workers will be kept on the job where their experience and expertise can be put to use. In the meantime, our industry will have the time and incentive to regain its competitive position in the world market.

I am also concerned about foreign control of production and milling operations within the United States. While our Federal Government may have chosen not to act in its own best



interests in saving this industry from extinction, other governments may not be as imprudent. I do not want to find this Nation's uranium resources entirely under the control of foreign nationals and, if a domestic industry owned and controlled by U.S. citizens is not maintained, that problem may well develop. For that reason, the Federal Domestic Uranium Purchasers Act contains a provision requiring Federal agency purchases to be from business entities owned and controlled by U.S. citizens or at least permanent U.S. residents.

In addition, this bill contains a provision deleting the "recovery of the Government's costs" language from that portion of the Atomic Energy Act concerning enrichment services. In so doing, my intent is to allow the Department of Energy to keep enrichment costs as low as is reasonably possible and thereby make the purchase of domestically mined and milled uranium an attractive proposition to our domestic nuclear power industry in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, this marks the final dying gasp of New Mexico's uranium industry. It is a bleak ending for thousands of men and women who worked to produce the yellowcake that made our country strong and prosperous during the last 35 years. My heart goes out to the workers in the section 23 mine who have gone home for good. I hope its not too late to save the rest of this industry from a similar fate.

□ 1430

#### SEARCHING FOR THE MISSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a Member of Congress but also as a parent—a parent who is increasingly alarmed by the number of missing and exploited children being reported every year.

If current trends continue, 1½ million of our children will be reported missing this year.

A large number of these children—some suggest as many as 1 million—will be classified as voluntarily missing. These are the runaways or so-called throwaways who are frequent victims of street crime or exploitation. In fact, recent studies have shown that 85 percent of the children who have been criminally or sexually exploited were missing from their homes at the time of the act of exploitation. These numbers have grown so large that some who study the issue now estimate that 1 in 4 female children and 1 in 10 male children will be molested or raped by the time they reach adulthood.

Then there are the between 25,000 and one-half million children who will

be victims of noncustodial parental kidnaping. These children, through no fault of their own, are caught in the middle of a conflict between mom and dad. The price exacted from these children will be measured in terms of emotional and physical abuse.

Finally, we can expect as many as 50,000 new missing children cases to stand unsolved at year's end. These are the victims of criminal abduction or foul play.

Statistics alone are not enough to define the problem. This issue cannot be brought into perspective without looking at the hundreds of stories behind every number. This year, children will be taken from shopping centers, farms, playpens, bedrooms, schoolyards, and bus stops. Studies show that those taken will range from the very poor to the very rich, will come from every race, and are just as likely to be taken in big cities as they are in small communities and rural areas. Sometimes a great deal of evidence will be found, and at other times parents will go for years without so much as a trace.

The story of the Bradbury family from southern California is not untypical. On October 18 of last year, 3-year-old Laura Bradbury was camping with her family in Joshua Tree National Monument in California. She followed her brother to the bathroom approximately 50 yards away. Five minutes later, he came out and Laura could not be found. An extensive 3½ day search of the area produced no trace of her and it was then determined she had been abducted.

In the days, weeks, and months since Laura disappeared, her friends and family have used every means available to locate her. They have established the "Laura Bradbury Organization" which, among other things, has distributed pictures of Laura on thousands of posters, fliers, and bumper stickers throughout southern California.

Behind me is one such example: This poster can be found at 30 bus shelters in the area Laura disappeared. As you can see here, it includes three different pictures of Laura. It also includes a description of Laura and a summary of the kidnaping. Also prominently located are two very important phone numbers. The first is an anonymous information line—(714) 960-3017—the second is the phone number for the San Bernardino Sheriff's Department—(619) 366-3781.

The "Laura Bradbury Organization's" strategy is simple: The more people that know about Laura's kidnaping, have her description, and know who to contact with information, the greater the chance that she will be found.

In a sense, the greatest challenge facing our society in terms of the missing children issue is one of education.

One California professor who has studied the problem commented that, "We find more stolen cars and stray animals than missing children each year." While the made-for-TV film "Adam" brought the problem widespread attention in 1983, it seems the more we learn about the issue, the more we realize how unprepared as a nation we are to deal with it.

At the end of this month, on April 29th at 10 p.m., NBC television will broadcast a program entitled "Missing . . . Have You Seen This Person?" This special presentation, hosted by David and Meredith Baxter Birney, will give nationwide attention to a number of unsolved missing person cases, including Laura Bradbury's. By using the resources of television, this special gives Americans a chance to "Join in the search" for these individuals and moves us one step closer to the goal of educating the public about the seriousness of the problem.

Next month, Laura Bradbury is supposed to celebrate her fourth birthday. We do not know if she will be found by then, but for her, and the thousands of cases like hers, we must be certain that every course of action is being taken.

At the Federal level, we were able last year to enact legislation which established a new toll-free "hotline" administered by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children—(800) 843-5678. This number is available to individuals who believe they have leads or information on a missing child and all calls are strictly confidential. I have also in the past supported legislation which requires the FBI to list missing youth in a national computer bank. These are important steps in the right direction, but there is much more that needs to be done.

Remember, too, that more often than not, it is easier to prevent a child from being taken than to find a missing youngster. Experts advise teaching even young children their full name, address, phone number, and how to place a long-distance phone call. It is also important for parents to know their child's blood type and have on hand a set of the child's fingerprints, current photograph, dental records, and hair sample.

As parents, it is easy to think that our child could never be taken. The record, however, tells a different story. As a nation, we must work together to educate our children, support the families of victims, and develop new methods of recording and finding missing children. As one victim who founded a nonprofit group to train search-and-rescue dog teams noted: "If we can spare one family the anguish we have, it will be worth it."

## AID TO THE CONTRAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the President's proposal to send more aid to the Contras waging war in Nicaragua. The kind of assistance the President is trying to send the so-called freedom fighters has been disguised as humanitarian aid this time. For some strange reason, our President feels it necessary to provide the Contras with "food, medicine, and other means of support for survival." We are talking about only \$14 million—forget about the Federal deficit for a few moments while we record this vote; it's only another \$14 million.

I can only begin to tell you what \$14 million would do to help rebuild the South Side of Chicago. "Food, medicine, and other means of support for survival" sounds like just what we need. It would restore \$12.5 million in health and human services and \$2 million for job training programs. We could teach our children, feed our families, rebuild our roads and our city and take care of our sick and elderly. Instead, our food stamps have been cut, our job training, our Medicaid and our Medicare have all been cut. It seems that the only way for us to get aid from this President is to take up arms and call ourselves freedom fighters.

I suggest that if the President is really looking for freedom fighters then he needs only to look over at South Africa where there are millions of them. They are fighting for freedom against a small but well-armed minority that continues to strip them of their citizenship in their own homeland. Over 300 South African freedom fighters have been killed in police violence in the past year, but the President has not proposed any aid for them—military or humanitarian. When South African police execute terrorist attacks against unarmed and innocent people attending funerals, the President accused the mourners of provoking the attacks. Through his policy of "constructive engagement," he has let the South African Government know that he supports their violent oppression.

It's obvious that the President doesn't recognize freedom fighters when he sees them. As long as someone is willing to pick up a gun, point it at the Soviet Union, and say that they're fighting communism, the President thinks that they are freedom fighters. The way to fight communism is not to put guns in the hands of everyone who claims to be an anti-Communist. When we learn to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and to support the fight for real freedom and democracy everywhere in the

world—including Central America and South Africa—then we will all be freedom fighters.

The President has learned a few tricks though. He has learned that we are willing to support peaceful negotiations in order to solve conflicts, that we in the Congress would rather solve problems through peaceful dialog than through military confrontation. And that is what has led to this incredible offer of "humanitarian aid" for the Contras. What the President hasn't learned, however, is that we in the Congress can see right through this disguise. Let there be no doubt about it; a vote for Contra aid is a vote for military aid. This is the same \$14 million that was military aid before, and in 60 days, it will be military aid again. A vote for the Contras is a vote for expanding the guerrilla war in Nicaragua.

The situation in Central America is dangerous enough without more arms or any more of the President's "humanitarian aid." And his meddling in the situation does not make it any better. There is a direct link between the over \$75 million that this administration has already sent down there and the growth of the Contras. From just a few hundred in 1981; today they number well over 16,000. We've bought and paid for them with American tax dollars. We've trained them, and we've armed them, and they've gone out and they've raped and pillaged and kidnapped and murdered innocent civilians in Nicaragua. If we had spent that same amount of money on education and job training in this country, we'd have less crime and lower unemployment. The money that we have already spent on the Contras has helped to spread the worst elements of war. The same money spent on our own people could have given us something to be proud of.

Make no mistake about it, I am as concerned with the security of our Nation as any other Member of this body. But I want the President to know that there are young people in Chicago who need jobs this summer, and that they're freedom fighters for jobs. I want the President to know that there are senior citizens in Chicago who need their Medicare and their Social Security, and that they're freedom fighters for Social Security. I want the President to know that there are hungry people in Chicago, and they're freedom fighters for food.

I want the President to know that there are freedom fighters all over the country. And I want him to know that the message is clear; if it's military aid, they don't need it and we can't afford it. If it's humanitarian aid, we need it. We need it at home. The fight for freedom in his own back yard isn't over yet.

Thank you.

□ 1440

## CENTRAL AMERICAN TRIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to report to my colleagues on my recent trip to Central America.

What I have seen there strengthens my belief that the President is correct when he says that we must be consistent and firm against the spread of international terrorism throughout Central America.

I visited three nations during my trip last week. Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua.

I saw a great contrast between Guatemala and El Salvador on one hand and Nicaragua on the other hand.

In Guatemala, the military government has promised free elections this fall. In spite of economic and other problems, Guatemala is moving toward democratic government.

In El Salvador, President Duarte told me that he is committed to a growing democracy at home and to finding a plan for peace in the region.

Duarte's government has brought stability to a nation which was plagued with violence. Today, the people appear to be committed to ending violence.

Stories of concentration camps are simply not true. I visited one of these camps, where people from the countryside live for their own protection. I saw no barbed wire or guards. I met the major of the camp. I talked to the people. They would like to return to their homes in the countryside.

Fear of terrorism keeps the people in the camps. An end to violence would mean a return to normal lives for the people of El Salvador.

In Nicaragua, the story is quite different. The people I talked to felt betrayed by their Government and by the revolution.

The only independent newspaper, La Prensa, must submit to total censorship. While I was there, the newspaper failed to publish because most of the material in the daily was cut by the censors. That has occurred 38 times in the recent past.

The censors removed all references to the Reagan peace plan from La Prensa, except for President Ortega's statement, calling the plan an act of aggression. Washington Post and New York Times editorials on the plan were also censored.

A nondenominational radio station must submit transcripts of all broadcasts, including sermons.

Religious leaders complain that they are not free to practice their religions, if they disagree with the Government.

There is no free enterprise. Businesses large and small are told how many workers they can employ, what



their salaries will be, what products they will produce and what price they will charge.

I spoke with a member of the Sandinista government, Alejandro Bandana, and I asked him about the lack of freedoms in Nicaragua.

He blamed the war for the lack of freedoms. The war does not explain the total lack of domestic freedoms. The war does not explain the large amount of men and weapons in Nicaragua.

Evidence does not support the idea that the Nicaraguans are fighting a defensive war with its neighbors. The evidence indicates that the Sandinistas are limiting freedoms at home and gathering weapons from abroad to wage an offensive war of subversion against its neighbors.

During my trip, I met with Government representatives in each country. I met with citizens from all walks of life on both sides of the regional conflict.

We also delivered medical supplies to a camp in El Salvador, and saw the needs of the people in that regard. Antiburn salve in our supply delivery was immediately administered to a young burn victim.

The question before the Congress on aid to Nicaragua revolves around the question of talks to encourage a freer and more peaceful atmosphere in all of Central America.

If those talks produce results, the Reagan plan calls for economic aid to help the people of that region.

If those talks fail and terrorism continues to be the rule in Central America, then the President proposes positive action to counter terrorist activities. Regional stability is the goal of this policy. The alternative is continued conflict and a wider spread of terrorism. ●

#### LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE HOSPICE CARE PROGRAM UNDER MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be joined by Representative BILL GRADISON in introducing legislation to extend for 3 years, the hospice benefit under the Medicare Program. As my colleagues very well know, Congress acted in 1982 to provide for the first time, full coverage and recognition of hospice care. The legislation introduced in the 97th Congress received the support of more than 240 Members in the House and more than 50 Members in the Senate. There was a strong, bipartisan feeling at that time that hospice care was an appropriate alternative to make available to care for the terminally ill. I am certain that support for hospice care continues today and should allow for the hospice benefit to continue.

Under the present program, Medicare beneficiaries are eligible for hospice care for up to 210 days if they are certified to be terminally ill and have less than 6 months to live. Certified hospice programs must provide care on a 24-hour basis in the home, on an outpatient basis, as well as inpatient care which must be limited to 20 percent of the total days of care. In addition, hospice programs must offer bereavement counseling to family members. At present, the hospice benefit is scheduled to expire on September 30, 1986. The legislation we are introducing today simply extends the current program for 3 additional years.

One area of concern in the current hospice program centers around Medicare payment to hospices. In determining payment to hospices, the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] has calculated per diem rates for various levels of hospice care. Since the development of this payment system for hospice reimbursement, I have been greatly concerned about the level of the per diem rates established by HHS. When first established, rates were set at \$46.25 for routine home care, \$311.96 for continuous home care, \$55.33 for inpatient respite care, and \$271 for inpatient care. Last year, Congress acted wisely to approve legislation to increase the routine home care rate to \$53.17, the level included in the proposed hospice regulations. However, continued concern exist in hospice programs around the country about the level of the hospice payment rates. With HHS receiving cost reports from hospice programs, I am hopeful that in the near future the actual cost of hospice care can be better determined and payment rates more appropriately established. Low and unrealistic payment rates discourage hospice programs from seeking Medicare certification and place a great financial strain on programs that are receiving hospice reimbursement. This is an inequity which Congress must stand willing to correct.

This measure to extend the hospice program clearly indicates our continued support for hospice care and our desire to avoid any uncertainty in the field amongst providers and beneficiaries about the continuance of the hospice benefit under Medicare. Implementation and participation in the hospice program has been somewhat deliberate. Of recent, though, interest and participation has been increasing and it would be a tremendous disservice to providers interested in obtaining Medicare certification to be unsure about the future course of the hospice benefit.

In addition, the initial legislation providing Medicare coverage for hospice care required the Department of Health and Human Services to submit to Congress prior to September 30, 1983, a report on the effectiveness of

the hospice demonstration projects. Also, HHS is required to report to Congress before January of next year on the effectiveness of the Hospice Program. An executive summary of the hospice demonstration project final report has just been recently released, and the contract for the report to review the effectiveness of the Hospice Program was just issued. Obviously, a quality report evaluating the success or any shortcomings of the hospice benefit is unlikely to be provided to Congress prior to January 1986. A simple extension of the current program should provide HHS with sufficient time to issue a thorough hospice evaluation report to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the compassionate form of care delivered by hospice programs in caring for the terminally ill, another major characteristic of hospice care is its cost-effectiveness. It is widely concluded that the substitution of hospice care for acute services offers a real opportunity to obtain cost-savings in the Medicare Program. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that hospice coverage under Medicare can save more than \$100 million over 3 years. The final report on the hospice demonstration project also concludes that hospice offers a cost savings over the last year of life. These facts are critical as we continue to struggle with the Federal budget to reduce budget deficits. We must strongly encourage the development and utilization of cost-effective programs such as hospice care.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is important as we seek to continue to provide support to the hospice movement around the country. Over the past decade, we have seen enormous growth in the hospice movement, and today there are estimated to be more than 1,200 operational hospice programs. Hospice care has proven that it is deserving to be a part of our Nation's Federal health care system. The legislation I am introducing will provide continued support to the hospice industry and provide additional time to evaluate the benefit and develop changes to ensure the success of hospice into the future.

The needs of the terminally ill and their family members are unique. Hospice care recognizes these needs, and we must continue our commitment to meeting the demands of the dying. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Following is the text of this legislation:

H.R. 2070

A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend hospice benefits under the Medicare program for an additional three years

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. THREE-YEAR EXTENSION OF HOSPICE BENEFITS UNDER MEDICARE PROGRAM.

Section 122(h)(1) of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (P.L. 97-248, 96 Stat. 362), relating to the end of the effective date for hospice care, is amended by striking out "October 1, 1986" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989" each place it appears.●

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be on the floor at the time that the House voted on Senate Joint Resolution 15, Helsinki Human Rights Day and House Concurrent Resolution 110, extradition of accused Taiwanese. Had I been present I would have voted in favor of both pieces of legislation.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present today when the House voted on rollcall No. 54. Had I been present I would have voted "aye." Thank you.●

REVENUE SHARING  
ABSOLUTELY VITAL

(Mr. KOLTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the President's new budget proposal would phase out general revenue sharing at the end of fiscal year 1986. This approach is shortsighted and will undoubtedly wreak havoc on thousands of local governments throughout the United States.

While revenue sharing is an important element in many municipal budgets, it is absolutely vital to the many communities that have not benefited from the general economic upturn. Towns and communities that have relied on a single industry like steel need revenue sharing now more than ever.

According to a 1983 survey conducted by the National Association of Towns and Townships, almost 34 percent of the 3,000 small governments that responded to the survey indicated that they relied on revenue sharing to fund their fire, police, or rescue services. Thirty-five percent used revenue sharing to assist in funding services to the elderly. Lastly, some 79 percent needed revenue sharing to fund transportation services at the local level.

While I agree that responsible budget deficit reduction will be pain-

ful, I believe we must also be fair to local governments. Raising taxes at the local level is not the answer. Yet, without revenue sharing, local governments will either have to cut programs or raise taxes. There is no other way around it.

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK,  
APRIL 14 TO 20

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss National Library Week and pay tribute to the libraries and librarians of the Nation during the week of April 14 to 20. National Library Week is not a new week. National Library Week is one like many others. We tend to pass easily over such designations, but I would like to take today as an opportunity to discuss at great length the meaning and significance of the Nation's libraries and information systems.

National Library Week is very much a part of our effort to pay homage to our educational system and to begin to recognize the fact that we are in an age of information, that our educational infrastructure thoroughly rests on libraries as a foundation, that without libraries as a foundation, our educational infrastructure would be totally inadequate.

The President has himself again paid tribute to National Library Week with the following statement, and I quote from the President's statement on National Library Week:

It gives me great pleasure to salute the American Library Association on the occasion of National Library Week, April 14 to 20. I am reminded of the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "It is a good reader that makes a good book."

If we are to be a nation of readers, we must help our children discover the treasures of the libraries of our schools and cities. Throughout life we must refresh ourselves at the fountains of knowledge and academic and special libraries. Although electronic technology has vastly expanded the universe of information, access to this information continues to be assured by the assistance of our nation's librarians.

I welcome this opportunity to congratulate and to commend to all Americans the professional librarians and the many able community volunteers who stand ready to assist us who seek knowledge and pleasure in books. On this 28th annual observance of National Library Week, I salute the millions of Americans who use the libraries network of information sources.

The library's open door beckons all to enter. I invite all Americans to join as a Nation of readers.

It is signed, Ronald Reagan.

□ 1450

I begin this special order with a reading of the President's statement on National Library Week, and I want to follow that by stating that the testi-

mony of the American Library Association, President E.J. Josey, at a press conference held yesterday with respect to National Library Week, follows in the same vein up to a point. And while the President, like most Members of Congress and most national leaders have only good words to use in connection with the Nation's libraries, the point of demarcation, the point of difference begins when we discuss the critical funding needs of libraries.

In my overall statement, I want to talk about the value and the cost benefits of modern libraries because the perception, the misguided perception of the value and cost benefits of modern libraries has led to a perception that libraries do not need money, that they do not need funding to operate.

We are faced with a situation where the President has high praises for libraries and yet he has placed zero in the budget for the Library Services and Construction Act. He has placed zero in the budget for the funding of college and research libraries and many other activities which relate to libraries have received scarce funding.

I also want to discuss the role of libraries in the learning society in this age of information. In the report that was prepared by the President's Committee on Excellence in Education, they referred to our age as an age of information, and they said that we are in a learning society where learning becomes vitally important from the cradle to the grave. At every level of our lives, we are in a process of learning, and the Commission addressed itself to the need to have resources, and the need to have institutions which help and assist Americans at every stage of that process of learning.

I also want to discuss the public library as a family learning center. And while it plays a role in this process of the learning society, the society which must provide Americans with the means and the resources for an education for their entire lifetime, I intend also to discuss information literacy and what that means.

We talk a lot about literacy, and literacy is one of the goals of the present American Library Association. But basic literacy differs from information literacy. The definition of information literacy is, a person is information-literate when they understand how to use information in their own work, when they know how to use the various tools that are available in their own occupations. And I want to discuss that and the significance of that for the Nation.

I also intend to discuss the current Federal information crisis, the policies of our present administration and how those policies impact on the provision



of information at every level in the American society.

Finally, I would like to conclude with a discussion of the state of the Federal library and information support effort, and that impact on the entire Nation.

Before I proceed, however, I understand there are others of my colleagues present or who will be submitting written statements for this special order on National Library Week.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. And I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to once again join my good friend and colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, in support and recognition of National Library Week.

I had the pleasure of visiting with Georgia members of the National Library Association in my office yesterday, and, as always, was further enlightened by the commitment our librarians have to the enrichment of our daily lives through teaching.

Library services are broad in scope and offer us the opportunity of lifelong learning. They have programs for parents and day care centers, as well as programs that serve children directly. They work in direct conjunction with our public school systems and institutions of higher learning to help students of all ages acquire basic reading skills and to promote the joy of learning and discovery. They provide literacy programs, materials for persons who are blind and disabled, books for disadvantaged students, and services for persons with limited proficiency in English. As you can see, our libraries truly benefit all segments of our society.

At a time when we face the most staggering Federal budget deficit in our Nation's history, I think it is important to remember that an investment in our libraries is an investment in our future. It is an investment which ensures the rights of all our citizens to get information and resources for continued learning. It is an investment which is important to the quality of life, from early childhood to adulthood. It is an investment which promotes sound government, enhances the quality of community life, and improves employment opportunities.

I join with my colleagues in thanking and commending our Nation's librarians for the outstanding work they do in helping to enrich the lives of millions of Americans through learning. Thank you.

Mr. OWENS. National Library Week is a time for millions of Americans to show their appreciation for the many diverse library services we use and enjoy. This is certainly a time to even

reemphasize the fact that libraries are a vital part of the national education infrastructure.

Libraries and information services of all kinds are increasingly more important as our society becomes more complex. Information literacy which is defined as the ability to use information in one's own work has become a major operating skill necessary to function productively.

What happens to libraries and information services has definite impact on prosperity, progress, and the security of the Nation as a whole. This year it appears Government funding for libraries is under a more intense attack than ever before. And, in addition to recommending zero in the budget for the Library Services and Construction Act, the present administration has signaled its intent to wage a full-scale war on the library and information support services provided by the Federal Government.

We view with particular alarm the actions of the Office of Management and Budget. It appears that David Stockman has become the unofficial censor, the book-burning czar of the Federal Government. OMB has indicated that it will continue to combine library services with janitorial and repair services and contract these executive branch libraries out to commercial companies.

Still worse, what has caused the greatest alarm is the announcement that OMB proposes to massacre the budgets of all information generating units except the information services of the White House. Thousands of publications, films, and other information items will be eliminated if in the wisdom of Mr. Stockman and his staff they are judged to be unnecessary.

There is good cause to fear that we are about to witness the equivalent of a massive book burning campaign. The OMB is guilty of gross abuse of power. No set of accountants or budget busters should dare to assume the awesome responsibility of deciding what information should be provided to the people of this great democracy.

There is ample evidence which indicates that this administration recognizes the value of information in our very complex society. The modernized, electronic information systems in the White House as part of the White House publications apparatus have required a budget increase at least four times greater than the amount budgeted for White House information services in the previous administration.

While making the claim that there is not enough money available for the standard information services to all of the people, it appears that Mr. Stockman has made unlimited funds available to promote the White House point of view.

During this National Library Week, which highlights so many diverse needs and accomplishments of so many different kinds of libraries, it is also important that the attention of the Congress be focused on ways to challenge the sweeping powers which are being assumed by the Office of Management and Budget. If far-reaching changes must be made in Federal publication policies and information services, it is the duty of the Congress to seek a more nonpartisan, responsible and rational way of reviewing and reshaping this vital function.

National Library Week is an appropriate time to remind the American people that the information policies of our Federal Government directly impact on the quantity and the quality of useful materials which are available in our research, academic, school, and in our local public libraries.

Consider the following letter addressed to Members of Congress from the president and chief executive officer of the New York Public Library in New York City, one of the oldest, largest, and most well recognized of the research libraries, which also happens to be the central library for the New York public library services. It serves three counties, Manhattan, the Bronx, and the county of Richmond.

Mr. Vartan Gregorian sent the following letter:

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY,  
New York, NY, April 12, 1985.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: At a time when the importance of an educated and informed citizenry has never been greater, there is grave danger that all federal support for libraries, a major source of learning and information for the nation's citizens, will be eliminated. I write to you, and The New York Public Library's librarians visit, to let you know of the harm that would result from these proposals.

The New York Public Library is a large and complex institution. It includes both circulating and research functions, and receives substantial public and private funding. Because of this complexity, the ways in which federal actions affect the Library are numerous. Administration proposals on a variety of subjects, if enacted, would have a devastating impact on our ability to serve the public. I would like to bring to your attention some of the major programs proposed for elimination or major reductions:

Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA). This program, located within the Department of Education, is scheduled for elimination this year. If this elimination is enacted, the New York Public Library would be forced, in turn, to eliminate or drastically reduce the many programs funded by LSCA. These include: training volunteer readers at our Library for the Blind, conducting literacy tutoring and English as a Second Language Instruction, publishing the Directory of Community Services, and providing a job advisory service. With LSCA funds we are also able, this year, to make one of our branches accessible to the handicapped, and to run a computerized data base for circulating libraries in the region. The projected annual loss to The New York Public Library

in LSCA funds would be \$989,000; the loss to those who use our programs and services would be much more.

Strengthening Research Library Resources (Title II C). A valuable resource for the nation's future will be lost if this Department of Education program is eliminated, as has been proposed. The rich collections of research libraries are well known; what is not so well known is the extent to which these collections are often deteriorating on the shelves or otherwise inaccessible. With a \$235,000 grant from Title II C, The New York Public Library is microfilming valuable material on World War I. Without this project, a valuable record would have decayed to the point of not being usable; now a filmed record exists.

The National Endowment for the Humanities is another agency of major concern to The New York Public Library. This agency is proposed for reductions of 11%. One program within the agency is singled out for a cut of 57%—The Public Libraries Program. While we oppose any reduction in the NEH funding, we particularly deplore the size of the reduction in the Public Libraries Program. The NEH has provided close to \$2 million a year in general operating support for the Research Libraries of NYPL. In addition, projects that have been or will be conducted with NEH support include: cataloging American Musical manuscripts, the exhibit and program "Censorship: 500 Years of Conflict," access to our manuscripts and archives collection, and the upcoming exhibit "New World Voyages in the Age of Discovery."

Revenue Foregone Postal Subsidy. The administration has proposed total elimination of the appropriation that supports 3rd class mailing for non-profit organizations and for the blind. In place of the appropriation, cross-subsidization is proposed whereby first class rates would subsidize non-profits and the blind. This is illegal under current postal law. Any change in the law would be controversial and would require lengthy review. The postal subsidy through appropriation of \$981 million must continue until such time as a new method becomes law. The enclosed fact sheet demonstrates that the cost to this institution would be over \$1 million if postal subsidies were eliminated.

Revisions in Tax Law. The New York Public Library has historically been supported by a partnership between the public and private sectors. Annual giving by private donors is essential to our operations, as are major gifts for endowment and capital needs. The incentive in the tax code for private giving is critical to maintaining and building this funding base. We urge that changes in the tax code not discourage the generous individuals whose help is critical to our future.

Telecommunications Costs. A new filing by AT&T before the Federal Communications Commission would send telecommunications costs for libraries skyrocketing. Computerized networks are increasingly a major means by which libraries provide information to users. Because libraries are committed to providing access to information and learning free of charge, we have no way of passing these costs on to users. Because this role of libraries is so thoroughly in the public interest, a special exemption on a "library rate" should be instated, and the AT&T request before the FCC should be denied.

I want to mention briefly two other agencies endangered by budget cuts, The Nation-

al Endowment for The Arts and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. The programs of these agencies provide essential support to libraries and other cultural institutions; we urge their continuation at current levels.

The sheer length of this list demonstrates the extent to which the administration's proposal will hurt libraries and the public they serve. For The New York Public Library, we estimate a loss of \$2 million from the elimination of LSCA and postal subsidies alone, with the potential of much greater harm from changes in telecommunications and tax policies.

I urge you to help reverse these damaging proposals. We and the citizens we serve need your assistance. Thank you for your consideration and attention.

Sincerely,

VARTAN GREGORIAN.

□ 1500

That is the letter from the president and chief executive officer of the New York Public Library. His library had been traditionally an outstanding innovative library providing services not only those traditional services to scholars, to students and to people who use its vast, tremendous research libraries but also providing services to people in all parts of New York in the three counties that they serve. They have been very innovative, they have had outreach programs to reach people who needed jobs, job corps centers. They have had career information centers.

There is practically no forward looking program, an outreach type of program which has not been sponsored by the New York Public Library.

In the neighboring area of Brooklyn, similar programs have been sponsored including a job information center funded by the Library Services and Construction Act and a career information center also funded by the same act.

These are examples of programs funded directly by the LSCA, and programs which would not exist if that act is not funded again.

The American Library Association, as a commentary on the report that was issued in the spring of 1983, the report which was called "A Nation At Risk" was submitted to the President by the Commission on Excellence in Education, made several outstanding comments which were later published, I believe important comments, published in a booklet which they entitled "Alliance for Excellence." In the Alliance for Excellence, the American Library Association points out the numerous ways in which no education system can go forward in this country unless it also takes into consideration the needs of the Nation's libraries. Every school, every college, every university has at its center, its very core, the appropriate library collections and services.

Beyond the school and libraries, individuals who continue their learning

also use public libraries and other special libraries.

□ 1510

If you consider the fact that each individual goes to school only a limited part of their lives, that if an individual gets a Ph.D. degree, it means that they went probably through 12 years of elementary and secondary schooling, 4 years of college training and 4 years of graduate work.

So at the minimum, an individual would spend 20 years in the formal institutions related to education, colleges, universities, public schools. The rest of the years of an individual's life, if they live to be 65, the rest of those years, 45 years, would be spent without the support of any one of those formal education institutions, and institution of the type of the public library is the only institution that they would be able to turn to for the kinds of extra support they needed beyond their own personal research and study collection.

The letter from the head of the New York Public Library highlights what the critical issues are facing libraries in our Nation at this time. The report from the American Library Association Task Force on Excellence in Education, which comments on the "Nation At Risk" report, has interesting commentaries on the basic realities in the "Nation At Risk."

I will read a few excerpts from this report as evidence of the kind of concern that the report speaks about.

Reality No. 1. The extent to which parents introduce their children to books.

Does the gentleman wish to speak on this special order? Mr. ROBIN TALLON of South Carolina.

Mr. TALLON. If the gentleman would yield 30 seconds to me.

Mr. OWENS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for arranging these special orders in recognition of National Library Week.

I have enjoyed the gentleman's comments on the LSCA Act; that those funds are very important to all our congressional districts. They are especially important in the congressional district that I represent, because rural South Carolinians have the same sense of isolation that all rural residents experience. Public libraries long ago devised ways to minimize this isolation by using bookmobiles to bring the library to those people living too far from the library.

My Sixth District is very large and heavily agricultural, thus a perfect candidate for bookmobile service. I am proud of the job our libraries are doing to bring needed information to rural South Carolina.



We are indeed in an information age, and it is important that all citizens have access to the vital information necessary for decisionmaking. Grants to purchase bookmobiles using the Library Services and Construction Act funds are enabling our public libraries to continue this long tradition of outreach.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, and I would like to comment that the Library Services and Construction Act has done most for small libraries, for rural libraries, and in many cases, the state support systems which now exist for rural libraries would not exist at all if it had not been for the passage of the Library Services and Construction Act more than 20 years ago.

That act allowed States to, for the first time, organize support staff, gave them money for administration overhead, allowed them to coordinate those libraries throughout the State which needed help most and provide collections to back them up.

So rural libraries will lose the most if we do not have continued funding for the Library Services and Construction Act.

I might also note that State libraries themselves in almost 30 States, the State libraries did not exist in any form other than to serve the State legislature before the passage of the Library Services and Construction Act. Thirty State libraries would be tremendously hard hit and services beyond service to their local legislatures would be cut completely if they do not have the funding which is found in the Library Services and Construction Act.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out that libraries are really funded throughout the Nation primarily through local and State sources. In fact, when you average it out, about 95 percent of the funding for libraries come from those two sources; State and local funding. Only 5 percent is Federal funding.

The question was raised, if so much is already provided by the local and the State governments, why do the not provide it all?

This is a curious inverse reasoning which penalizes those who have done the most and takes away the most flexible funding. The funding that appears in the Federal Library Services and Construction Act is flexible funding which allows systems to cooperate among themselves which finances interlibrary loans, which does the kinds of things which they could not afford otherwise.

They also are in a situation where the cost of libraries has risen dramatically, and to take away that 5-percent funding for libraries would seriously jeopardize their local funding in many cases.

Federal funding is used as matching grant funds in some cases, and those matching grants—the other amount would not be there if you did not have the Federal funds to begin with.

Part of the problem, as I said before, is the perception of the value of libraries, the low perception held by the present administration. Nevertheless, this administration does put a great deal of emphasis on education, or at least does a great deal of lip service with respect to education.

For this reason, I am going to quote from the report of the American Library Association which comments on "A Nation at Risk."

In considering "A Nation at Risk," the ALA task force discussed several realities. Reality No. 1 is that learning begins before schooling. The extent to which parents introduce their children to books, culture and learning affects children throughout life. "A Nation at Risk" points out to parents the following:

"As surely as you are your child's first and most influential teacher, your child's ideas about education and its significance begins with you. You must be a living example of what you expect your children to honor and emulate. Moreover, you bear responsibility to participate actively in your child's education. You should nurture your child's curiosity, creativity and confidence.

Above all, exhibit a commitment to continued learning in your own life.

The commentary by the ALA follows:

Research shows that children who have been exposed to reading and other cultural experiences before they begin school have a better chance of success in formal learning than those who do not have this experience.

Among the most important of the preschool experiences are the development of skills in listening, speaking, and looking that prepare for reading and form the basis for the enjoyment of learning.

And it goes on to point out how libraries do provide this service.

Library service to parents for example, and to day care staffs, support preschool learning in a variety of ways. Libraries provide books for adults to read aloud to children, groups of children in child care and day care centers, and in public libraries often listen to stories and act them out.

Children borrow books and records from libraries. Toddler programs that bring very small children and their parents to the library together provide a basis for later, more independent use of libraries by children as they grow older.

It was pointed out several years ago that when a group of citizens in New York City were questioned about services that they would be willing to pay higher taxes to receive, one of the items that stood out was that those individuals who were parents of young

children indicated they would be willing to pay higher taxes if they could be guaranteed better library services, especially in the area of books for children and books for parents, books which told about parenting and child rearing.

Reality No. 2, as pointed out by the ALA comment on "A Nation At Risk" states that good schools require good school libraries. Good schools enable students to acquire and to use knowledge, to experience and enjoy discovery and learning. It enables them to understand themselves and other people, to develop lifelong learning skills, and to function productively in a democratic society.

Libraries are essential to each of these tasks, and library students learn how to locate, organize and use information, and that information will expand their horizons and raise their self-expectations. Librarians are teachers, and they serve both students and teachers.

□ 1520

"A Nation At Risk" states that the elementary years "should foster enthusiasm for learning and the development of the individual's gifts and talents."

This item from "A Nation At Risk" describes what occurs when elementary schoolchildren develop early and lasting pleasures in using libraries.

In Indiana, a study showed that reading skills, verbal expression and library skills were significantly greater in an elementary school after library services were increased. Disadvantaged children in Boston increased their skills in verbal expression of ideas and their language ability after 12 weekly 1-hour library programs with books and story telling.

Access to a library for quick fact finding and sustained work on a project should be among the rights of every child and every young person. The student who encounters a librarian who is directly involved in teaching has access to a much wider world than that of a single classroom. The librarian at successive grade levels introduces literature and teaches research study skills. From the librarian a teacher learns how to locate, interpret, and present information.

Too many of the 105,000 schools in the United States have inadequate school libraries because they lack the staff, they lack the materials and space and services required by students and their teachers. Even many of the schools that have library materials provide few library services because they lack professional librarians. Almost 3 million pupils, 7 percent of the total in the Nation, attend public schools which do not have school libraries. In 1982 our country had only one school librarian for every 954 stu-

dents. This is equivalent of an average of only 20 seconds a day provided for each student.

The lack of librarians is especially severe in elementary schools. For example, in Los Angeles, our country's second largest city, in only 20 of the city's 450 elementary schools is there a full-time librarian.

Furthermore, in the last decade, the number of school library supervisory and consultant staff at State and district levels has declined sharply.

In "A Nation at Risk" the National Commission on Excellence in Education recommends higher educational standards and expectations. They recommend increased time for learning and increased attention to English, mathematics, science, social studies, computer science, and foreign languages.

To achieve these requirements, school libraries must be stronger. Librarians who are less bound by curriculum sequences than classroom teachers can improve the performance of students in every grade, in every subject, at every level of ability.

To ensure that every child has access to the quality of school library service needed in a learning society, public officials should do the following. These are recommended by the ALA Task Force on Excellence in Education: They should require that library research and information within the library program and in all subject areas at each level of elementary and secondary schools. They should establish more specific State standards for school libraries. They should require school superintendents, boards, parents, teachers, and other interested people in every community to prepare a plan for developing school library resources, for using these resources effectively and for coordinating services with public libraries in their communities. They should supply sufficient funds for school library programs so they are staffed to coordinate the teaching of research and study skills, in cooperation with teachers of English, social studies, science, mathematics, and other subjects. They should provide funds for sufficient library books. They should earmark State education funds for school library resources and program development and not allow these funds to be used in any way deemed necessary by the local administrators. They should ensure that each State education department has skilled State library media supervision staffs to provide the needed statewide professional leadership. They should require colleges and universities to provide future teachers with training in the using of libraries and library materials. They should require that education programs for school administrators and other education specialists include training and the administration and supervision of

school libraries. They should also target Federal education funds to specific school library resource development programs, including those that use the new technologies and those that demonstrate exemplary services.

Reality No. 3 deals with people in a learning society and their needs for libraries throughout their lives.

Reality No. 4 deals with public support of libraries in an investment in people and communities.

The recommendations for public support of libraries as an investment in people and communities is as follows: To ensure that libraries serve us all effectively, public officials should appropriate funds for library services targeted toward individual and community needs for job information, for literacy and for development, as well as toward more general needs of library users. They should demand excellence in their academic institutions, public school and special libraries. They should supply each State library agency with the funds and staff needed to work with the public officials and libraries of all types in planning services and sharing resources. They should mandate that State and Federal Government documents and the products of Government-sponsored research are available to all through library network programs. They should institute a library rate for telecommunication and they should convene a State and national conference of library users, librarians, library policy makers, and public officials to assess the capacities of our libraries to serve the learning society, to measure the change which has taken place since the 1979 White House Conference on Library and Information Services, to encourage sound, long-range community-based planning for library services and to initiate local, State, and Federal action to improve library services.

There are all actions which are recommended by the American Library Association's report which is entitled "An Alliance for Excellence," which is a commentary on "A Nation At Risk," the report of the President's Commission on Excellence in Education.

I have spent the time to enumerate some of the positions of the American Library Association because there is a great need that the perceptions of the American people and the perceptions of the Members of Congress and the policymakers be changed with respect to the meaning of libraries. The traditional perceptions of the library as a quiet place is an acceptable one. We do not want to get rid of that perception. There is a need still in our society for quiet places. The perception of a library as a place where people are serious, can get away to study, can find resources they need, the perception as a place for introverts or bookworms I do not think is necessarily a derogatory

perception. Our age needs bookworms and we need introverts. Introverts are the people who prepare the programs for computers, software packages for computers. Introverts are the people who design computers. In the age of information, we need introverts, as we need every other kind of person.

So if it is perceived as a quiet place, a place for bookworms, a place for introverts, that is acceptable also.

But beyond that, the library must be seen as a place which extends to every citizen the kinds of resources for learning, the kinds of resources for self-improvement that are not available except for people who have means. Certain individuals can provide all the resources they need, they can provide for their own basic library, they can provide for their own reference books, they can provide for their own computer services, they can provide for their own electronic information services. Corporations can provide for their own electronic information services. There are colleges and universities which certainly provide for their students.

One of the goals of many of the public libraries is to place at a level where each individual can reach the services of electronic data bases. These data bases are quite costly. It means that information which originates in Washington by electronic transfer can be transferred to any part of the country, that any youngster in any part of the country could receive that information if his public library had the electronic equipment necessary to receive it.

One of the problems that we have is that taxpayers and policymakers at every level refuse to recognize that these kinds of modern information bases exist, that no library is up to date and current unless they have the capacity to finance these kinds of modern retrieval and retrieval units. This kind of technology must be paid for. And while we are ready to accept increases in cost in many other areas, we do not want to accept the fact that a modern library also has to bear these increased costs.

If you consider the fact that one MX missile costs \$74 million, and the amount of money that is being cut from the present budget for library services is \$118 million, for less than two MX missiles we can supply the money needed to fund the Library Services and Construction Act. If you consider the modern costs and how they compare, you will see that the library costs or the portion of library funding borne by the Federal Government is a trivial, very tiny, minuscule amount of money. If you consider the fact that a fighter plane at the end of World War I cost less than \$100,000, and we now pay for a fighter plane more than \$18 million, a fighter plane



now costs \$18 million, and it cost less than \$100,000 at the end of World War I, you can see how the cost for the military has escalated, but nobody wants to recognize the fact that the cost of libraries has also escalated to a lesser degree.

□ 1530

Whereas books averaged, hard-back books, averaged, at the end of World War II, less than \$3 per book, and reference books were as low as \$5 per book. No reference book can be purchased for less than \$30 to \$50, and the average hard cover book costs between \$10 and \$15 in 1985. The costs are escalating continually.

Libraries have traditionally been called upon to stretch the rubber band; to be very flexible and get as much out of the least amount possible. They have done this through programs of interlibrary loan and working with each other in systems. Through programs which reach across States and across the whole country, they have been able to foster systems which provide first-class services for second-class costs.

This rubberband at this point has been stretched to the limit, and it is about to break. They cannot continue to provide these kinds of services if policymakers at every level do not begin to recognize the serious problem that they face and the kinds of costs that they must have, the funding that they must have to meet their costs.

Libraries are presently one of the best bargains in our public service structure. You cannot find another agency or another service which serves as many people for as little cost. One must consider the cost-benefits ratio; how we get such a tremendous amount of benefits from our libraries with such a small amount of cost.

Measuring the costs of libraries is one of the tasks that certain library professionals have set for themselves and done a very good job. I commend to the Members the studies of the King Research Associates who have done several studies for the Federal Government to measure the actual value of libraries to the Federal Government. One of the most outstanding studies by the King Research Associates was a study of the Defense Technical Information Center which is responsible for all of the technical information in the Department of Defense.

The Defense Technical Information Center's product, its materials, are very heavily used by scientists and engineers. These scientists and engineers use these resources for very practical purposes; nobody questions the fact that they are using them and the fact that they are needed. They use them for very practical purposes. Defense, of course, has the highest priority in our Federal Government, and the services that they use were measured

in this study by submitting a questionnaire to the scientists and engineers who use DTIC, the Defense Technical Information Center, and the use of this information was evaluated by the scientists in terms of how long it took them to get, how much time it saved them when they found a technical booklet, or a book or whatever, kind of material that was useful to them. How much time it saved them; what kind of innovation it allowed them to undertake as a result of revealing something that had been done before, or in various ways, how the provision of information from the Defense Technical Information Center allowed them to go forward in the research that they were doing or in practical projects that they were working on.

When the study was over, when they had measured the cost and multiplied the cost, multiplied the time that it took by the kinds of salaries that were being paid to these engineers and scientists, the amount of value attributed to the Defense Technical Information Center, was more than \$30 billion. The value of that collection was assessed at more than \$30 billion.

Mr. Don King of the same King Research Associates estimates that the value of our public libraries throughout the Nation in terms of the time they save for people who are seeking knowledge and information is estimated at more than \$10 billion.

They are doing studies now at the Department of Energy Technical Resources Center, and they estimate similar large savings that are realized by scientists and engineers as a result of using these collections.

We are not only interested in having libraries to provide technical and scientific information, but it is good to compare the cost and the use of the technical and scientific materials because they are what the hard core, so-called practical thinkers who are making decisions in Government are willing to consider. They show the value of libraries in our modern age of information.

As I said before, when you measure these kinds of costs against the costs that we pay for our armaments, especially for our MX missiles, you can see that the amount of money that is being requested in the Federal budget for libraries, and the amount of money that libraries use across the country in general, is a very miniscule amount.

It is very significant to note that at the same time we are forcing tremendous cutbacks with respect to funds that are placed in the budget for libraries. We are also, at the Federal level, cutting back on the availability of library materials and library services with the Federal Government.

This administration, since 1981, has relentlessly pushed back the availability and cut back on the availability of information services and materials. I

have in my hand a chronology prepared again by the Washington office of the American Library Association which is called, "Less Access to Less Information By and About the U.S. Government." It is a chronology from 1981 to 1984, and it reads as follows. I will read some of the highlights of the kind of atrocities that have been committed against information systems and information services over the last 5 years.

In September of 1981, David Stockman, the Director of OMB, issued an Executive Order requiring that Agency heads pay special attention to the major information centers operated or sponsored by their Agencies.

Among the types of information centers to be evaluated were clearing houses for the public; information analysis centers; and resource centers. Evaluation criteria included these questions: Could the private sector provide the same or similar information? That was a question always asked. Is the information services provided on a full cost or recovery basis. This was the opening gun for a series of memorandums which later resulted in the present OMB circular which calls again for the elimination of numerous information services and materials.

The OMB was not limiting their attack, of course, to mere materials and services, although they did have press conferences and they had on display bags of booklets and various kinds of information published by the Federal agencies. One of those booklets that they have chosen to eliminate recently is a booklet called, "Infant Care."

"Infant Care" was considered to be a waste of the Government's money. The continued publication of that particular classic. I would ask you to consider the fact that the Federal Government, the taxpayers of this country, are financing medical services for numerous mothers and children who would have used that book "Infant Care." We pay the cost of every mother who is on Medicaid; we pay for that cost and we pay for the child's health care costs also.

If every mother on Medicaid alone were given a copy of "Infant Care" and if, as a result of reading "Infant Care" or a similar booklet provided by the Government, the care that that mother provided for her baby resulted in the baby not getting sick just one or two times, numerous dollars would be saved by the Federal Government which does pay the bill for Medicaid when that mother who is on Medicaid goes to the hospital.

The whole concept of preventive health care begins with information. For any Agency of Government to assume the powers that have been assumed by the Office of Management

and Budget, and begin to dictate to every branch of Government those branches which serve health care institutions; the branches which service businessmen, labor statistics, every branch of Government, is dictating what publications they can publish; which publications shall be published in what amount, and how those publications shall be disseminated. That kind of power, resting in one agency, is detrimental to the dissemination of necessary information useful to the society as a whole, and useful to the whole of society to hold the Government accountable.

I offer as another example the decision made by the Office of Management and Budget or the Department of Labor under pressure from the Office of Management and Budget to discontinue the publication of certain Department of Labor statistics related to the cost of living for families. Those statistics will no longer be published; they are considering the discontinuation of the publication of materials which relate to occupation outlook; the kinds of materials which have been used for years by libraries and other institutions that provide guidance for various people who are seeking jobs.

All of this results from the kind of perception that the present administration holds for information and information services.

□ 1540

It is quite evident that the present administration does value information services because they have greatly increased their own information apparatus. They are providing their own press releases on electronic equipment. You can get the full text of all of the press releases from the White House. You can get the full text of certain chosen documents out of the executive branch directly on electronic retrieval machinery. They understand the value of information to convey their own point of view; however, they are determined to deny this kind of access to information to the average American.

What has happened as a result of these kinds of policies is an information crisis generated by the assumption of these powers by the Office of Management and Budget. One of the Office of Management and Budget's actions has been commented on by the American Library Association in the following pamphlet, which is entitled "Government Information: Is it a public good or a commercial product?"

The Office of Management and Budget has requested public comment on a draft policy circular which, if implemented, will sharply reduce the Federal Government's efforts to collect and disseminate information to the public. It will also accelerate the current trend toward the commercialization and the privatization of Gov-

ernment information. The proposed circular was published in the March 15 Federal Register. Corrections are in the March 24 Register, and this umbrella circular supersedes four existing Office of Management and Budget circulars.

The draft circular's definitions and policy considerations bear careful review in light of the trends in the past 4 years to reduce public access to Government information. Section 8(a) of this draft states that public access to Government information is to be provided consistent with the Freedom of Information Act. Yet, the ALA has documented that Federal agencies are increasing fees to the public. Fees are being increased for record retrieval, including Federal information requests. These fees can be high when an individual requests information that must be retrieved by a computer.

For example, in the October 29, Federal Register, the U.S. Postal Service published standard charges for the system utilization services and they range from \$189 to \$1,827 per hour. In other words, a citizen who wants to use electronic retrieval processes to get information from his Federal Government might pay from \$189 to \$1,827 per hour.

While automation clearly offers promises of savings, will public access to Government information be further restricted for people who cannot afford computers or cannot pay for this computer time?

Among the basic considerations and assumptions of this OMB circular are "that the public and private benefits derived from Government information must exceed the public-private cost of the information." This means that any information wanted by any public person, any person who is a member of the public, that information will be given to him only after cost recovery is considered. In the analysis of key sections under the information dissemination, OMB maintains that the mere fact that an agency has bothered to create or collect information is not itself a valid reason for creating a program to disseminate the information to the public. Maximum reliance on the private sector is stressed.

OMB states that this is merely an application of a policy which is stated on OMB Circular A-76, which is called A-76 Performance of Commercial Activities. Section 8(a) of the same draft states that the product or the service must either be required by law or the product or service, meaning the book or the pamphlet, must be clearly permitted by law and it must be essential to the agency in accomplishing its mission, but OMB will judge what products and what books, what pamphlets, are essential to the agency for accomplishing its mission. The products or services are not to duplicate similar products or services that are already

provided by other governmental or private sector organizations or can be reasonably expected to be provided by them in the absence of dissemination by this particular agency.

The definitions of information by the Office of Management and Budget are as follows: It means any communication or reception of knowledge, such as facts, data or opinions, including numerical, graphic or narrative forms, whether oral or maintained in any medium, including computerized data bases, paper, microfilm, or magnetic tape. Access to information refers to the function of providing to members of the public any information in any one of these forms. In other words, the entire information-generating capacity of the Federal Government is brought under one umbrella, under one agency, the Office of Management and Budget.

The crucial question that I want to raise is: Should any agency of the Federal Government have this kind of power which, in the ultimate, amounts to the power to censor, and if an agency of the Federal Government must have this kind of power, should it be the Office of Management and Budget? The primary concern of the Office of Management and Budget is to cut costs, a policing function related to accountability with respect to the expenditure of funds.

Does that mean that the Office of Management and Budget is required to decide who should read what books produced by which agencies of the Federal Government?

On the 29th of this month, this question will be discussed, will be reviewed, by one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations, the Subcommittee on Government Information, Justice, and Agriculture, which will review not only the telecommunications policies of the Office of Management and Budget, but the hearing is also expected on April 29 to consider the recently issued Office of Management and Budget circular on management of Federal information resources. This circular has some provisions that would affect agency plans for the electronic collection and dissemination of information. The draft OMB circular was published in the Federal Register and comment has been asked, and the committee will also forward their deliberations, I suppose, to the Office of Management and Budget as a result of that hearing.

In conclusion, the entire apparatus of the Federal Government with respect to information begins at the level of the Congress and the White House because information is a record of decisions that are made or it is a record of phenomena observed, and decisions are made in Washington as nowhere else, decisions that affect the entire world. Decisions that are made



by the President affect the greatest number of people probably in the world. Decisions that are made by the Congress affect a great number of people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BOUCHER]. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude in a few minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ECKERT] the Republican, also gave me time from his 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that that extension cannot be recognized at this time. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman only has 1 hour.

Mr. OWENS. In conclusion, I would like to recognize the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ECKERT] did offer 1 hour for the discussion of the Library Services and Construction Act and National Library Week, and I want to take note of that fact.

My time is up, but I wanted to note that fact and thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. ECKERT] for giving me that time and conclude by saying that it is recommended that the Federal Government, the Congress, take a more active role in the review of those policies which are being made with respect to information and library services, and it is too important for the administration alone to decide. A nonpartisan commission is necessary to decide exactly how the information services and the information materials generated by the Federal Government will be disseminated and utilized.

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, as we enter National Library Week, I am pleased that Congress has set aside this week to honor our libraries. It is important, not only to acknowledge our libraries and salute our librarians, but also to take a closer look at library services.

The traditional library, as a source which provides needed books and publications for citizens, companies, and other organizations, plays an important and well-understood role in our society. Yet a closer look at libraries reveals that libraries have assumed new and exciting roles in this information age. Libraries are progressing and evolving. They are making use of new technology and are expanding their information capacities.

In my State of Minnesota, many libraries have access to computer systems and data bases and hence, are able to conduct basic searches for general and specialized information of almost infinite variety. Searches may assist in the setting up of small businesses, exploring careers, reviewing patent information, retrieving unobtainable publications, and even providing instantaneous medical informa-

tion, to hospital operating rooms. Such services enhance economic and social development. Their use adds breadth, vitality, and achievement to the daily lives of our people.

The modernization of our libraries, through the use of improved communications and computerization, has also allowed for the evolution of a system of networking and information exchange between the many different types of libraries. Public libraries, hospital libraries, school libraries, college/university libraries, government agency libraries, and law libraries, are able to combine resources in order to offer vast amounts of information by interlibrary resource sharing.

In my State, Federal library funds have been well used and there is strong private-public sector cooperation and sharing of information and materials. This triumph of cooperation over turf rights is most encouraging. The sharing and availability of ideas benefits everybody. Resound sharing is helping our citizens and Nation to grow.

I commend our library systems and I thank the people who make them work. If you haven't visited your local library lately, drop in and look around. It changed and it can serve you better. Modern libraries are every day broadening our horizons in new and unexpected ways.

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, as you may know, 28 years ago our Nation observed the first National Library Week. During this year's National Library Week, April 14 to 20, it is with the greatest pleasure and pride that I salute both the professionals and community volunteers who are ever ready to assist those of us who seek knowledge or pleasure in books.

I can think of no better time than when we are commending the service of our Nation's libraries, to also mention the realities faced by libraries in our districts as they attempt to provide information and other services to the people they serve. After meeting with several library representatives from my home State of Arkansas, I feel even more strongly compelled to speak out on behalf of our Nation's library network.

As information services become the focal point of our Nation's progress, libraries are confronted head on with the problem of providing a readily available, free entrance to the world of learning. To this end, the Library Services and Construction Act has strengthened and assisted local and statewide planning, coordinated present services for maximum effectiveness and met the needs of many sectors of our population for new services and facilities. The elimination of LSCA, as proposed in the fiscal year 1986 budget, would mean that the progress made in reaching those areas

without library services or with inadequate services would be halted.

I know that LSCA has benefited the people of Arkansas immeasurably by, among other things, reaching the elderly, handicapped, and shut-ins with bookmobile services; providing local book deposits so that those living in rural, mountainous areas do not have to travel into large cities to obtain reading materials; providing assistance for serving the deaf; and operating programs for functional illiterates. I am happy that our colleagues in the Senate have at this point agreed to freeze LSCA at the fiscal year 1985 level, and I strongly urge Congress as a whole to continue to provide full funding of LSCA in fiscal year 1986.

Libraries are but one of many groups that are dependent in large measure on nonprofit mail and revenue forgone. The fiscal year 1986 budget proposes that no money for this postal subsidy be appropriated. If such a proposal were to be enacted, it would mean that the library rate has increased a mind boggling 1,243 percent over the 7 cents that existed for 2 pounds in 1970, when the Postal Reform Act was enacted.

Every extra dollar libraries spend on postage is a dollar less for purchase of library resources. Libraries on fixed budgets and their users, especially the elderly, the handicapped and those in rural or isolated locations who depend on library books-by-mail services, cannot absorb such hefty postal increases.

Libraries share resources through the use of such new technologies as computerized data bases and telecommunications. However, the continued ability of libraries to improve services through telecommunications has been severely shaken by a series of private line tariffs filed over the last year and a half as a result of the AT&T divestiture. The cost of these tariffs could represent increases from 50 to 100 percent in user charges. It is doubtful that any library budget could absorb such a drastic increase, and therefore lower rates for library telecommunications are needed. It is my hope that a special library rate will be established.

These are but several of the issues that are threatening the future of our Nation's library network. As we continue through the budget process, I urge my colleagues to keep these realities and the future of our Nation's libraries in mind. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would again like to congratulate all of those librarians and community volunteers who keep the doors to a world of learning open.

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad and tragic commentary on the Reagan administration's priorities when Members of Congress must rise to speak out against administration proposals to slash funding for libraries, library

construction, and library-related services. So it is with a sense of urgency and immediacy that I rise to join my colleagues in participating in this special order on libraries and library issues.

Libraries are crucial to the well-being and education of all people. Libraries and the services they provide to all a window to the past, tools for the present, and guides for the future. Many civilizations have come and gone, but their libraries have survived and from them we have been able to learn how people lived and worked thousands of years ago, how they confronted the problems of war and peace, famine and drought, birth and death, taxes and reform, justice and morality. One can say that the issues confronting civilization have not changed over thousands of years, because ancient man's problems are the same as those of modern society.

The administration pays lip service to the needs of American education, but seeks to reduce funding for one of the cornerstones of that education and of American society, the public library. The local public library performs vital functions, functions that are essential for improving education. Their collections educate the young and the old, provide tapes and records for the blind, preserve the daily record of the Nation's newspapers and magazines, and preserve the history of our Nation. They present an invaluable resource to students and scholars, technicians and mechanics, farmers and industrialists and to every segment of American society. When libraries close, which would be the result of the administration's proposals, America and her citizens suffer immeasurably.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the administration's proposals to eliminate funding for the fourth year for the Library Services and Construction Act, to reject their proposal to eliminate the postal revenue foregone subsidy, and to strongly support continued Federal aid for library and library-related issues. America needs more educated people. We need people who know how to use the information available in libraries to accomplish the kind of things they want to accomplish. We need people who have better skills at every level. The one institution that supplies education for people throughout their lives is the public library, and we cannot afford to let the administration's plans to severely cut back on library services be made law.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it would do us well to remember that our libraries are the repository of our great literature, and that public libraries are a vital aspect of a free and democratic society. One of the first things that the Nazis did when they came to power in 1933 was to burn, in a public ceremony, all literature that did not conform to Nazi ideology. They de-

stroyed the function of a free and public library in society, a function that calls for the free flow of literature and the exchange of ideas without fear of persecution and torture for putting into writing what one has thought. In America, we happily enjoy our public libraries, and we should not endanger their future by eliminating funding for them.●

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot lately about our "national security" interests. Most of that talk concerns weapons of destruction and military assistance overseas.

But if we are truly concerned about our national security, we will look to the strength of our people at home. And a good indication of that strength is the ability of our children to cope with the information explosion that has taken place during our lifetimes. Through technology and widespread communications networks, we have access to books, records, tapes and other vehicles of education that were unheard of even 25 years ago.

This week, we celebrate one of the most important institutions in making that information available to all our people—the libraries. Through their dedication to excellence and to equal access to information, libraries and the staff who maintain them provide a unique and irreplaceable service to the communities across our country.

Without libraries, access to this new information would be restricted to those who had the time, money and commitment to seek out and purchase the materials. With the libraries, every family in the United States—whether rich or poor, large or small—can enrich their lives through reading, listening or viewing.

I join with my colleagues in saluting the libraries of America, and the librarians and others who bring life to those institutions through their expertise and concern for knowledge.●

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague, MAJOR OWENS, in his special order to focus attention on the fourth consecutive Reagan budget proposal which attempts to eliminate funding for the Library Reconstruction Act and other library services and programs.

In New York State alone, the enactment of the fiscal year 1986 library recommendations would result in reductions and eliminations of essential library services such as: Circulation and research functions; Federal grants used to maintain artifacts; operation support systems and; computerization of expanding information networks.

The deficit created by this administration is causing unfair and ultimately damaging budget priorities for this country. Alternate deficit reduction initiatives must be proposed, but eradicating the traditional functions of our cities public libraries is not a solution. Educational enrichment translates

into limitless educational opportunities. We cannot allow the special role of the public library system to falter. It is a valuable instructional and research center. Computer literacy, second language education and services for the disabled are key to advancement of millions of Americans.

The public library system helps to create an informed and knowledgeable society. I urge my colleagues to support funding at the fiscal year 1985 levels for our public libraries nationwide.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am rising to voice my opposition to the administration's proposal to cut library funding.

As usual, the administration has got its priorities backwards. This Congress is being asked to approve more than \$300 billion for next year's defense budget. What the administration is failing to recognize, is that the defense of this country begins with an educated populace.

Our strength in the future, will rely heavily on our ability to maintain a technological advantage over our adversaries. Increasingly, we will require educated men and women not just for research and development, but to operate the sophisticated weapons of tomorrow.

A strong public library system should be among the cornerstones of our educational system. As all aspects of our society become more dependent on high technology, our need for public and research libraries will continue to grow. I believe it is very shortsighted to try to balance the budget by cutting library funding. We are already spending less than we should in this area. If we cannot increase funding, we should at least have the good sense to leave this part of the budget alone.●

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, many of us had the opportunity to meet with librarians from our districts who were here in Washington to inform their representatives of the effects of various administration budget proposals on the Nation's libraries.

During the past 4 years we have seen many shortsighted approaches to reducing the deficit, but it strikes me that the administration's repeated attempts to balance the budget by reducing support for libraries is among the most foolhardy. Libraries are a priceless national resource. They provide millions of our citizens with the opportunity to educate themselves, to expand their cultural horizons, or to just have a relaxing evening with a good book.

They are an integral part of the social life of our communities. In my own congressional district on Long Island, libraries are vital social centers. Very often I hold my town meet-



ings in local libraries, and I can attest to the fact that the libraries are a natural meeting place for all groups within the community. That is why the administration's proposal to eliminate the Library Services and Construction Act strikes at the heart of villages and towns across the country. In the past, Congress has rejected this proposal, and I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we will once again be wise enough to see through the false appeals to fiscal austerity and approve renewed funding for this important legislation. As a member of the Budget Committee I will support adequate funding for the full range of library services.

I would like to commend my colleague from New York, Congressman MAJOR OWENS, for organizing this special order. Mr. OWENS, who was himself a librarian, has been a strong defender of library programs and understands clearly the important role they play in our community.●

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, a great nation is dependent upon an educated and informed citizenry. It is quite natural, therefore, that over the years, our Government has made a genuine and sincere commitment to the preservation and expansion of our public library system. This year, however, this commitment is in jeopardy. This year, the Federal budget includes no funding for our public libraries. This is wrong.

Public libraries are the cornerstone, the foundation and the support beams of our educational system. Without accessible, viable, up-to-date libraries, we weaken the entire structure of our society.

Federal funds for libraries represent only a small portion of a library's operating expenditures but these funds are critical for prototype and special programs. Federal funds, combined with State and local support, have resulted in a 30-year local-State-Federal partnership guaranteeing lifelong learning opportunities for our people, research and development information for our industries, and quality education for our young.

This week, the week of April 14-20, 1985, is National Library Week. It is appropriate at this time that we reaffirm our commitment to one of our society's noblest institutions, the public library.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to unite and vigorously support the funding of the Library Services and Construction Act and the Higher Education Act Title II.

As a nation, we must demand excellence in our educational institutions and in our public libraries. If we fail the task of providing our citizenry with the best of all possible learning centers, we will fail as a people. But if we succeed—the possibilities are endless.●

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the future of our great country lies with its children. If the United States is to grow and prosper we need to provide good educational programs for our children. Research has shown that exposure to books at an early age is important for reading and later school success. Children who use their public libraries tend to do better in school. Public libraries are playing a vital role in this area by encouraging parents to read to their children and by providing stimulating programming for children to demonstrate the joys to be found in books. Library Services and Construction Act funds have been to hire children's librarians and to develop pilot projects. These demonstration projects have proven to be the most effective way to show local officials the benefits of improved library services for children and the need to provide for them with local funding. Libraries in South Carolina have had marked success in using LSCA funds to stimulate local support.●

● Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in recognizing the significant contributions of public libraries. Our comments today are in honor of National Library Week, which recognizes the vital services provided by libraries.

In my congressional district, which is largely rural, people rely heavily on the services provided by our rural libraries. Public libraries provide not only books and publications, but they join with local governments and educational institutions to provide various community services. In many cases, the library serves the role of a community center.

For example, libraries in South Carolina have undertaken an extensive program to combat illiteracy. According to recent estimates, 20 percent of all Americans are functionally illiterate and 75 percent of the unemployed have inadequate reading and writing skills. In many areas in South Carolina, one-third of our citizens lack the basic literacy skills needed to meet the requirements of adult living.

To address this problem, public libraries in my State, with assistance provided under the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1984, have supported projects that now provide tutoring in reading and writing to some 2,293 adults—a 41-percent increase since last year. In my home county of York, our public library has sponsored an innovative project to reach first graders with reading problems. I commend our libraries for their efforts to meet this critical need.

Our libraries are the repositories of some of our greatest cultural achievements and they provide an invaluable public service. They make the written words of our civilization available to our people and they help to cultivate

our capacity and interest for reading and learning. I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the significant and enduring contribution made by our public libraries.●

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation's vast library system. In Minnesota alone, we have 330 public libraries and 30 mobile libraries serving nearly 4 million people in addition to numerous other academic, college, and vocational technical libraries throughout the State.

We are reminded of our Nation's impressive array of information dissemination services during this our 28th annual observance of National Library Week. We are also reminded that once again we must wage a battle against the administration's proposal to zero out funding for library programs covered under both the Library Services and Construction Act and the Higher Education Act. For the fourth consecutive year, the President has requested no funding for these programs.

The impact of such a proposal would be devastating to our Nation's library system. In an ever changing society as ours, the broad education provided by libraries is important both because of what it contributes to one's career goals, as well as because of the value that it adds to the quality of our lives.

The services provided by libraries range from making available the daily newspaper to neighborhood residents to supplying information necessary for the completion of a research project. I know from my experience as a teacher that in our schools' libraries, students learn how to locate, organize and use information that will expand their horizons and raise their self-expectations. Our public libraries assist small businesses and other industries by ensuring adequate sources of information that will allow them to expand their operations.

Adequate funding is necessary to provide for sufficient numbers of books, audiovisual materials, magazines, computer software, and other materials that will ensure that an adequate supply of information is available to those in all walks of life.

I would like to thank my colleague Mr. OWENS for arranging this special order and I would like to thank our librarians across the country for their service and dedication to this worthy program which provides a vast array of information to those in our society.●

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from New York [Mr. OWENS] for asking for this special order to commemorate National Libraries Week. Libraries have consistently served communities throughout the country not simply as depositories of literature, but also as important components in maintaining and

improving the standard of living in the neighborhoods of this Nation.

I would like to inform my colleagues of an exemplary library located in the Corona-East Elmhurst section of my congressional district in Queens County, NY. The Langston Hughes Library and Cultural Center is a special project of the Queens Borough Public Library, funded by the Library Services and Construction Act. Named for Langston Hughes, a black American writer who was able to transcend different forms of literature to portray the many facets of black life in this Nation, this unique institution is under the direction of a community board of directors and is staffed by community residents.

The Langston Hughes Library opened its doors on Corona-East Elmhurst in April 1969. The community demanded the library, fought for it, and the residents of the area have worked for over a decade to maintain it. The library was designed to meet the special needs of the neighborhood by providing necessary educational services to an economically disadvantaged area. Due to the unique characteristics of this community resource center, Langston Hughes has offered a full range of services, including tutorial and remedial assistance for schoolchildren, a community referral service, and varied cultural events and activities.

Mr. Speaker, the Langston Hughes Library is a special place in Queens. It is a model of excellence in community responsibility, and a jewel in our Nation's library system. It is important to note the achievements of this praiseworthy organization, and the individuals who contribute so much to their community, so others may emulate them. I ask the Members of the Congress of the United States to join me in congratulating the Langston Hughes Community Library and Cultural Center and its fine officers: Andrew P. Jackson, executive director; Rodney Lee, curator of black heritage; Jack Harris, director of cultural arts; Grace Holmes, director of the Homework Assistance Program; Una Grant, coordinator of information and referral services; Grace V. Lawrence, chairperson of the Library Action Committee; and Gale Jackson and Carl Rogers, Librarians.●

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, public libraries throughout South Carolina are experiencing growth in book collections and in programs. Unfortunately, many of our library buildings are not sufficiently large or modern enough to accommodate this growth. The jobs bill in fiscal year 1983 enabled the South Carolina State Library to assist 11 public libraries in construction projects, including one in my hometown of Edgefield, SC. Fiscal year 1985 Library Services and Construction Act funds will enable three

or four libraries to proceed with building plans. However, this is just the tip of the iceberg.

A recent survey by the South Carolina State Library indicates a need for at least 136 public library building projects, which include new buildings, expansion of existing buildings, or renovations for handicapped accessibility, energy efficiency, or to accommodate new technologies. LSCA funds are a small share of the total costs of construction, but it has proved to be the carrot needed to encourage local funding activity.

Libraries are the key component in the enhancement of the educational level of citizens across the Nation. I am delighted that this time has been set aside to give national recognition to the library system.●

● Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my distinguished colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, for organizing this special order today during National Library Week. As we are in the midst of saluting the National Library Association, it is an opportune time to think about our national priorities and examine how libraries are affected under the administration's budget proposals.

Yesterday, I was visited by constituents representing libraries in my district. They handed me a copy of a letter signed by President Reagan commemorating National Library Week. In that letter the President states that we must help our children discover the treasures to be found in our Nation's libraries. The President also states that the open doors of our Nation's libraries "Beckon all to enter." I am shocked that a President who could make these statements would propose a budget that would effectively limit our children's access to those treasures and which will do irrevocable damage to our libraries' collections.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's budget requests zero funding for programs vital to our libraries. No funding has been requested for the Library Services and Construction Act. Title I grants of this act enable libraries to serve disadvantaged citizens who would otherwise be denied access to library services enjoyed by others. Title II of this act provides grants to help provide adequate library facilities. Title III provides important moneys for the planning, establishment, and operation of cooperative networks for libraries at all levels. The administration has also axed funding that is vital for our universities to maintain and improve their collections. Perhaps our President does not really mean that all should have access. How can the President on the one hand commend libraries, their users, and librarians, but on the other hand condemn the future of our libraries.

Mr. Speaker, these Federal programs are very important for my constituents. As of June 1984, there were 207,141 registered borrowers at the 12 libraries in my district. From July 1983 to June 1984, over 1 million books were loaned out to readers in the Ninth Congressional District. In 1984-85, the Library Services and Construction Act and Higher Education Act funds provided \$8.6 million to New York's libraries. Although this money provides only 2 percent of library operating expenditures in New York State, these funds are critical. The programs funded by these Federal grants allow our libraries to reach out to people they would not otherwise be able to serve.

There is a very special library in Queens, the Langston Hughes Community Library and Cultural Center, which is used by many of my constituents. This unique library was designed to meet the special library needs of an economically disadvantaged area and is governed by a community board of directors made up of volunteers of the community. The library's black heritage reference center provides one of the city's largest circulating book collection of black heritage reading materials. This special library meets the needs of the community by providing tutorial services, community information, cultural events, and activities. The Langston Hughes Library has become a model and has been visited and studied by librarians, educators, and students from all parts of the country. The library depends on funding from the Library Services and Construction Act. Without these important funds, the excellence and the very existence of the library is threatened.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's libraries allow our citizens to grow, to learn, and to expand their knowledge. Our Founding Fathers recognized the importance of an educated populace. In fact, Benjamin Franklin established the first public library.

I urge my colleagues to carefully examine the administration's proposals which threaten to undermine a tradition of support for public libraries. As part of my celebration of National Library Week, I pledge my support for the programs which allow Americans of all ages, from all walks of life, to enjoy the riches that are to be found in our Nation's libraries.●

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, this week has been set aside to acknowledge the importance of libraries in all aspects of our lives. National Library Week is being celebrated across the country from Sunday, April 14 to Saturday, April 20, 1985.

Our Founding Fathers were clear, from the very beginning that broad access to information was essential to the success of the American democrat-



ic experiment. A quote from James Madison is no less apt today:

Knowledge will forever govern ignorance. And, a people who mean to be their own governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy; or perhaps both.

Today, our country is at a critical juncture in assuring adequate access to information. The technologies through which we communicate are changing at an unprecedented pace. The organization of communication services and industries, such as our public libraries, is also undergoing radical revision. And our capacity to keep up with these rapid advancements has been steadily eroded by an administration whose priorities do not include the free and widespread access to information envisioned by our forefathers.

The President's fiscal year 1986 budget includes the termination of all Federal support for public libraries. Dollars which have traditionally been used to support special services such as programs for illiterate adults, talking books, braille manuscripts for the blind, and outreach services to handicapped citizens, orphanages, and prisons are in danger of total elimination. Elimination of financial support for our libraries will further weaken a crucial link on our Nation's information network.

Specific effects of the Reagan administration's current proposals include:

The elimination of the 4th class library postage rate and free postage for the blind and handicapped.

The reduction of library services for approximately 15,000 people in each State.

The termination of outreach services for 8 million people who are homebound or confined to orphanages, hospitals and prisons.

The discontinuation of special programs for blind and handicapped citizens who are virtually totally dependent upon public libraries for information.

We cannot afford the cost of such proposals if we mean truly to govern ourselves. During National Library Week, we should reflect upon the power of knowledge and its value to the continued success of the "democratic experiment" we embarked upon over 200 years ago.●

● Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, today, in the midst of National Library Week, I feel it appropriate that we take the opportunity to salute the timeless services that our libraries provide for us. Knowledge, as the foundation of any stable, rational society, is not a value that depreciates with age. It is a value that should, and must, be actively pursued; and as institutions devoted to the task of spreading and increasing

knowledge, our libraries have performed admirably in this regard.

I am proud to report that the libraries of my district have instituted community programs that have made sources of learning available to more people than ever before. Some of these programs include federally funded workshops designed to call peoples' attention to the traumas of Alzheimer's disease; a book accessibility program which provides books for preschoolers, invalids, and individuals experiencing reading difficulties; and a drive to computerize and implement a statewide library card system that would make most collections open to any Illinois resident. In addition, the Campaign Public Library acts as an information finder for smaller businesses in the area, providing newly emerging businesses with market and loan information.

A desire to learn begins with one's exposure to the repositories of knowledge. Clearly, the libraries of Illinois remain steadfastly committed to this fundamental precept and to the ideals so nobly represented by National Library Week.●

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend my colleague from New York, Mr. OWENS, for his leadership in sponsoring this special order. The services provided by our Nation's libraries have proved to be of unparalleled public benefit and deserve our continued support. There a number of issues before us in this Congress which have a particular impact on libraries, and they must receive appropriate consideration.

First and foremost is the issue of funding for libraries. Last year we reauthorized the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) through 1989, demonstrating bipartisan support for this act. Although the administration has proposed elimination of these funds, we in Congress have recognized the tremendous contribution our libraries continue to make. The library is an integral part of our educational system and is as central to our communities as our schools and supermarkets. Libraries serve the very young and very old, and all of those in between. In addition, they meet the needs of special constituencies, such as the blind and other physically disabled, who might endure the greatest loss if funding were eliminated.

In New York, the LSCA supports vital services provided by the New York Public Library. The Special Service Programs, which receive funding under the act serve not only my district and the rest of Manhattan, but also the Bronx and Staten Island. Among the services supported in New York are those provided by the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, which serve these three boroughs plus Queens, Brooklyn, and all of Long Island. In addition, the

LSCA supports numerous urban library programs. These include job information centers, which provide information on career opportunities and techniques for finding employment. The literacy centers, which have a waiting list at all times, enable trained volunteers to tutor illiterate adults on a one-to-one basis. Learners' advisory centers, which also receive funding under the act, provide educational and career guidance for adults and teenagers. The LSCA also supports outreach projects, which provide services to disadvantaged and ethnic groups and have proved of tremendous benefit to minorities. Further, the community information services and directory, another urban library program, provides updated information on local and citywide services in every neighborhood branch of the library.

Of equal importance is funding for research library resources. These libraries preserve our Nation's heritage by maintaining collections which might not be preserved were these funds not available. The 26 million books, manuscripts, newspapers, periodicals, maps, prints, photographs, musical scores and other materials available through the New York Public Library's research libraries are used by 1½ million people annually. Over 350,000 of these users come from outside New York City and 150,000 visit from outside the State. The library makes these resources available to other institutions around the world through its cooperative programs. Only by devoting considerable resources to preservation and conservation programs is the New York Public Library able to maintain these invaluable collections.

Clearly, continued support for library services appropriations is essential if we are to maintain these educational and social services in our communities and preserve many of our historical resources throughout the Nation. However, these are not the only issues before us which affect libraries. Of great concern is the revenue forgone postal subsidy. Libraries are not the only beneficiaries of this important appropriation. The blind and handicapped, as well as other non-profit organizations which benefit the public, all depend on lower postal rates. Eliminating this subsidy would critically impair the ability of libraries to distribute educational and informational material to the public, a vital part of their service. The Postal Service estimates that a fiscal year 1986 appropriation of \$981 million is required to maintain subsidized postal rates at current levels. If the revenue forgone postal subsidy is eliminated, our libraries would have to devote to postage, money now spent on books and other library resources.

Our country's libraries also receive vital resources through the Public Libraries Program at the National Endowment for the Humanities. Continued support for the Endowment, and the Public Libraries Program in particular, is vital to meeting our libraries' needs.

We are grappling with the issue of growing budget deficits, and this will force us to make some difficult choices this year. However, reducing support for our Nation's libraries would do a great disservice to the American public, especially children, the elderly and disabled. Clearly, there are other portions of the budget which can be reduced, and they would make a greater dent in the deficit while doing far less harm than cutting the funds which are so important to our libraries.●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's libraries provide a vital resource for our population. They are one of our first lines of defense, for they protect our citizens from ignorance, illiteracy, and isolation. They help to insure that our country does not fall behind in the most vital race of all—the race for knowledge, which helps us maintain our competitive position in the world.

Clearly, the President does not understand the importance of the need for this type of defense, for once again he is attempting to undermine the fiscal viability of this country's libraries. His most recent budget proposal calls for eliminating all funds for both the Library Services and Construction Act and title II of the Higher Education Act. He has made similar proposals in the past. Such cuts would be extremely harmful to the State of Connecticut which I represent; of the \$7.858 million administered by the Connecticut State Library, \$1.676 million are provided by the Library Services and Construction Act.

These funds, along with matching State moneys, are used to provide both basic library services and to fund special programs through grants. The special programs funded recently in the Third District of Connecticut, which I represent, have made an enormous contribution to the life of the community. Among these projects are:

The After School Program for Children on Their Own in West Haven, which provides library and educational programs for latchkey children, both in the library and in their homes.

The How Two's and Three's View Program in New Haven, which acquires books and films, and provides educational experiences, for young preschool children.

The Materials for Patient/Inmate Libraries Program which operates within New Haven and provides reading materials for those confined to mental institutions.

The Foreign Language Materials Program, operating in West Haven, purchases materials in foreign languages appropriate to the needs of this community.

The LEAP Program, operated through the Southern Connecticut Library Council in Hamden, which brings the latest computer technology to the region for the purpose of facilitating the location of library materials for use in interlibrary loans.

Mr. Speaker, from the above list of special projects in Connecticut's Third District, it is clear that libraries are moving into areas beyond their traditional boundaries. This trend is to be applauded. We in Congress must do all that we can to ensure that it continues, and that the more traditional programs of the library, which are so important to the education and enrichment of our population of all ages, flourish. We must hold to the belief that national defense means more than military security; it means an educated, well-read population with the resources to expand its horizons as well.●

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, over 30 years ago, the renowned nuclear scientist, J. Robert Oppenheimer, said:

The open society, the unrestricted access to knowledge . . . these are what make a vast, complex, evermore specialized, technological world, nevertheless, a human community.

Our Nation's libraries play a major role in providing that unlimited access to knowledge which creates our human community. And libraries serve as important cornerstones of democracy in building critical thought and freedom of inquiry.

In my district alone, there are 30 libraries serving schools, universities, and the general public. Eight of these libraries participate in a regional program providing reference assistance, books, and audio-visual materials to citizens of several counties. Last year, Toledo, OH, was deemed to be the fourth best read city in the Nation based on use of public libraries as listed in "The Book of American City Rankings." All of us in Ohio's Ninth District are proud of our libraries and the many services they provide to our citizens.

But in today's budgetary climate, libraries are threatened with the elimination of vital Federal funds. This will severely limit their ability to serve as public sources of information, knowledge, and understanding of our world. Among the fiscal year 1986 budget recommendations are proposals to eliminate funding for the fourth year of the Library Services and Construction Act—even though Congress reauthorized the LSCA for 5 years last fall. Library grant programs under title II of the Higher Education Act have also been targeted for removal. The proposed elimination of postal subsidies

will increase the costs to libraries that mail books and materials to the blind and physically disabled. For Ohio, these devastating reductions would amount to over \$11 million in lost services to the illiterate, the disadvantaged and older Americans, funds for construction and renovation of libraries, support for resource sharing and postal service for materials to the blind and handicapped.

Thomas Jefferson, who recognized the importance of libraries by donating his collection to the Nation after the British burned the Library of Congress in 1814, said, "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at dawn of day." Let us be thankful for our libraries which enable the light of knowledge to be shed for all.●

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1550

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] and I be allowed to switch our positions in the roster today, and that I be allowed to proceed with my special order at this time and that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may take my place on the roster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY INCONSISTENCIES

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], for allowing me to proceed at this point, and he will proceed a little bit later on.

Another gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] and I have jointly requested this special order because we are very troubled by a very fundamental inconsistency in American foreign policy. We have a situation in the world in which the administration tells us we must, as a matter of high national policy, continue to finance a body of revolutionaries in Nicaragua.

People on both sides are being killed. I am not here to talk particularly about atrocities by one side or the



other because the relevant point is that that sort of atrocity, the killing of people who volunteer to fight, the killing of innocent people, the destruction of property, and the wounding of small children, is unfortunately in our modern age inevitable when people resort to war. That is not an argument for pacifism. It is an argument for, not easily but for purely political reasons, precipitating a war or financing a war. So we have to look, I think, very carefully at what the justification is for this country continuing to finance a war in Nicaragua in which people get killed.

Well, the administration tells us that that war has got to continue until the Nicaraguan Government, in the elegant diplomatic phrase that our President chose to use—no doubt borrowed from Metternich or one of the 19th century diplomats—as the President said, must “cry uncle.” Well, on what must they “cry uncle”? What must they concede to our President to get him to agree that it is not a sensible use of American tax dollars for us to continue to fight this revolution or to finance it?

Well, he says, they must be democratic, they must have free elections, they must treat their people in a civilized fashion. They are told that “if you don’t treat your people in a civilized fashion, you can’t presumably expect America not to make war on you.”

Here is what we have from the President on July 18, 1984; these were the remarks of a participant of the White House outreach group, and the President said:

If the Sandinistas want cooperation and friendship from the civilized world, then they can start by treating their own citizens in a civilized manner. A substantial part of the justification for making war in Nicaragua is that the people of Nicaragua are not given full democratic liberties.

That is what the President said. He has set several conditions which he says they have to agree to if we are to stop financing a war against them: First, they have to stop being a surrogate for the Soviet Union and Cuba; second, they must reduce their armed forces, which are now 100,000, they must reduce to a level comparable to those of their neighbors. The current imbalance, we are told, is incompatible with regional stability; third, they must stop support for insurgents and terrorists in other countries nearby; and fourth, the Sandinistas must live up to their commitment to democratic pluralism made to the OAS in 1979. The internal opposition is entitled to participate in the political process of the country.

All right, there are four conditions. First, they have to stop being a surrogate for the Soviet Union and Cuba, but that is really an overstatement for the other three. Then they must not

have an armed force which is disproportionate to others in the region; they must stop supporting terrorists and armed insurgents elsewhere in their region; and they must treat their country’s people democratically. If not, the President says, we will make war on them; we will use American tax dollars to finance this very bloody killing on both sides.

Well, I looked at these conditions, Mr. Speaker. They had a certain familiarity to them. Let us think about another country which has an armed force very disproportionate to anybody else in its region, larger than almost anybody else in the region combined. Let us look at one which has troops in fact in other countries and which is actively supporting armed insurgencies against other internationally recognized governments, and let us look at one that is as repressive to the majority of its people as any government in the world—South Africa. One would have naively thought, looking at the Reagan administration’s criterion for one where we finance revolutions, that South Africa would have been high on the list. By almost every criterion given here about Nicaragua, the South Africans are far worse.

Does anybody think that I am disappointed in and critical of the Sandinista regime’s failure to live up to promises that were made for full democratic rights for their people? Unfortunately, many governments in the world fall short of that. The problem is, what is the best way to respond to that?

Now, with regard to South Africa—and let me say, having said that I wish the Sandinistas had lived up to democratic principles better than they did—no one could seriously contend the absolute denial of basic humanity, which is the lot of the majority of the people of South Africa, the black majority, and no one could deny that they are treated by their government in a far more repressive fashion and a far less democratic fashion than the people in Nicaragua. It is simply hypocrisy to argue that we are so offended by the censorship of *La Prensa* in Managua—and I deplore that censorship—that we must finance a revolution against the government that censors it, but we can be the best friend in the world to the Government of South Africa. Because that is what we are.

There is a glaring inconsistency in the policies of the administration regarding Nicaragua and South Africa. To be South Africa’s best friend, to preach constructive engagement, to support South Africa at the United Nations against others who would condemn it, to be even more than our Western allies the friend of South Africa makes it very difficult to have anyone believe that this administration is really motivated by a concern over democracy within Nicaragua.

Here is what he said in July, 1984:

If the Sandinistas want cooperation and friendship from the civilized world, then they can start by treating their own citizens in a civilized manner.

What are we told about South Africa? Well, here is what we are told about South Africa by Assistant Secretary of State Elliott Abrams. He is the human rights specialist of this administration. They do not like what South Africa does, but he said, in September of 1984, and I begin to quote:

But we must recognize we are dealing with another sovereign nation and, by no means, the only country in the world to abuse human rights. We cannot dictate to that nation’s leaders how to conduct their internal affairs, but we certainly can and do offer our own reactions to what we see.

To the brutal regime of South Africa, repressing its black majority as badly as any human beings on this Earth are mistreated, we must remember that we are dealing with a sovereign nation and we cannot dictate to them how to conduct their internal affairs. To the people of Nicaragua, we can say to them, “We will make war on you until you have elections we like,” because that is one of the conditions, and as I read the President’s proposal for which he wants to get our approval, all of them have to be satisfied. The Nicaraguan Government has to cancel the elections they had and have new elections, and that is a condition. That is a condition for us. We are not talking now, by the way, about giving aid to Nicaragua. We are not talking about any form of cooperation.

Secretary Shultz says we will continue to pay people to shoot people in Nicaragua until they have elections that we think are fully OK, but with regard to the absolute repression in South Africa, well, that is a sovereign nation, and we cannot interfere.

The hypocrisy is overwhelming, and we are here—and I am about to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND]—to drive that home. We cannot consistently talk about the sorts of policies that this administration has in Nicaragua and South Africa and make any sense of them.

We are told, with regard to South Africa, “constructive engagement.” Let me read one more suggestion, the next time you hear the President say that Nicaragua must “cry uncle.” Among the things they must “cry uncle,” they must live up to our version of democracy. I wish they did. I wish that every country in the world did, the Philippines, South Korea, and the People’s Republic of China.

I think the President is right to have a rapprochement with the People’s Republic of China, but let us not confuse the Chinese Politburo with the American Civil Liberties Union or even the Republican National Committee. This is no great “gang of democrats,”

but it is OK with the People's Republic of China. It is hypocrisy to pretend that internal democracy or its lack in Nicaragua has anything to do with it.

Here is what the President said about South Africa. This was in December 1984.

If you are practicing quiet diplomacy, you cannot talk about it or it won't be quiet anymore.

There is a brilliance here we have not fully appreciated in this man's subtlety.

And then he says:

I have always believed that it is counterproductive for one country to splash itself all over the headlines demanding that another government do something because that other government is then put in an almost impossible political position.

He thinks it is tactically unwise to demand that the South African Government stop shooting down innocent black South Africans who are protesting their repression, but he can insist that the Nicaraguan Government "cry uncle" about internal democratic proceedings or else we will pay people to go and make war on them.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND].

□ 1600

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I also want to say I truly appreciate the gentleman's wisdom as well as his leadership on this matter. The gentleman and I discussed just the other day the contradictions and hypocrisy that the Reagan administration has espoused. We are truly disturbed by those contradictions.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday Secretary of State George Shultz said of U.S. policy toward South Africa, "We must not stand by and throw American matches on the emotional tinder of the region."

Earlier, he had stated:

The only course consistent with American values is to engage ourselves as a force for constructive peaceful change. It is not our business to cheer on, from the sidelines, the forces of polarization that could erupt in a race war; it is not our job to exacerbate hardship, which could lead to the same result.

Yet, the Reagan administration has chosen to do just that—throw American matches on the emotional tinder—in its Central American policy.

The blitz and hype surrounding the President's request for aid for the Contras in Nicaragua and his call for the continuation of the worthless policy of constructive engagement for South Africa highlight the inconsistency and hypocrisy which the President has time and time again demonstrated in his foreign policy.

The President has equated the Contras in Nicaragua to our great Nation's Founding Fathers—true democrats. He continually refers to them as freedom fighters, as opposed to Contras, and is

earnestly setting out to convince the American public and Congress that these "freedom fighters" are groups of peasants, farmers, small businessmen and others disillusioned with the Sandanista Government who desperately seek a free and democratic Nicaragua.

I cannot understand how the President can justify calling a band of men and women whose hallmarks are rape, pillage, kidnapping, and murder freedom fighters. How did the President come to the conclusion that the Contras are made up primarily of humble Nicaraguans disillusioned with the revolution? It is a known fact that the largest group of Contras is made up of former national guardsmen from the Brutal Somoza regime. The brutalities executed by the guardsmen under Somoza caused Nicaraguans en masse to rise against the government. How can then can President Reagan claim that the majority of Nicaraguans now support these same people who inflicted such atrocities on them earlier?

The President continues to claim that we have a moral obligation to help these terrorists in the name of democracy.

Let's turn to another region now, South Africa. The conflict in South Africa has received almost as much publicity as the conflict in Nicaragua lately. And the conflicts in both countries do have some similarities.

President Reagan is highly critical of the Sandinista government because of what he perceives as questionable elections and repressions of government opponents, freedom of the press, and the private business sector.

But what of the Botha government in South Africa? The overwhelming majority of South Africans have no political voice, let alone a vote. Those who oppose the government are jailed, mysteriously disappear, or are murdered. And what greater repression of the private business sector than keeping a majority of a nation's people restricted to certain areas and in such destitution that the thought of owning a business is not even a fantasy?

Yet the Reagan policy regarding South Africa is "quiet diplomacy." In no way does the President want to offend Botha. But Reagan appears to have no qualms about offending the Sandanista government. He continually attempts to intimidate them by sending troops to train in neighboring Honduras and urging support of the Contras. Reagan has chosen confrontational politics in Nicaragua and silent politics in South Africa.

In South Africa, as in Nicaragua, there are factions who do not agree with the government, who have never had illusions about democratic treatment from the government. The overwhelming majority who oppose the South Africa's apartheid system are the humble of South Africa. I do not

deny that some in South Africa have taken a more strident approach to ending the abuses of democracy and human rights in South Africa, like the African National Congress.

President Reagan, however, does not acknowledge the people fighting for freedom and democracy in South Africa as freedom fighters.

Based on President Reagan's statements that we "have an obligation to be of help where we can to freedom fighters and lovers of freedom and democracy" and that we should stand in strong support of those who have had "tyranny imposed on them by force, deception, and fraud" I would think that the President would seek consistency in his foreign policies.

Therefore, shouldn't President Reagan recognize and aid all freedom fighters who strive for democracy and justice? I've drafted a resolution calling on the President to be consistent in his foreign policy. If he insists on calling the Contras in Nicaragua freedom fighters and aiding them then he should also recognize members of the African National Congress in South Africa as freedom fighters and secure aid for them as well.

But while the President may find it perfectly justifiable to intimidate and confront the Sandinista government in order to enforce Reagan approved politics, he becomes defensive when asked why the United States is not doing more to bring about change in South Africa. He tries to explain that quiet diplomacy is the only policy that will bring change in South Africa. His policy in South Africa seems to be a one of wishful thinking—if he wishes long and hard enough maybe apartheid will go away. If this is the case, President Reagan isn't wishing enough, because apartheid is still present in South Africa and only cosmetic change has occurred.

In dealing with Nicaragua, Reagan has chosen to do more than wish away the problems there. He has been so eager to bring about change that he has allowed for the flagrant abuse of laws.

The Boland amendment—which President Reagan himself signed into law—prohibits the use of funds for the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government. Yet the Reagan administration has violated this law several times, from the CIA approved manual on overthrowing the Sandinista Government to Reagan's approval before the American people for the removal of the Sandinista government unless the Sandinistas cry "uncle."

An earlier spending cap of \$24 million for direct and indirect aid to the Contras was repeatedly violated. The New York Times reported that the CIA charged some of the costs of rebel programs to accounts other than those covered by the \$24 million cap.



The Times further reported that the living expenses of some rebel leaders' families and salaries of some CIA employees sent to Honduras, as well as the cost of CIA manuals, had been charged elsewhere.

And when the United States was prohibited from funding the Contras, President Reagan appealed to friendly allies to aid the Contras.

Time and time again Congress has come to learn of actions taken in regards to Nicaragua after the fact, a clear violation of the Intelligence Oversight Act.

America's Watch has concluded that the Contras "have attacked civilians indiscriminately; they have tortured and mutilated prisoners; they have murdered those placed hors der combat by their wounds; they have taken hostages; and they have committed outrages against personal dignity."

Yet, these are the people the President has dubbed freedom fighters. A group Ronald Reagan, as our Nation's leader, has chosen to be the recipient of U.S. support and aid.

I am reminded of the saying, "If we allow an immoral government to speak for us then we are responsible for its acts." I do not believe the "silent majority" (as Reagan likes to call the public) wants to be responsible for the atrocities being supported by the Reagan administration. I am speaking out and I urge all concerned Americans to do the same.

□ 1610

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his great leadership.

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. And I will yield to my friend in 1 second. I just want to summarize a couple of points and then we will open it up.

The point that we want to focus on is much of the justification for the President's request for \$14 million, but \$14 million is only a small part, for continuing substantial sums from America to finance a revolution against the Nicaraguan Government, to finance the Contra attack, is the lack of democracy within Nicaragua. There were other justifications as well, but I reread again Secretary Schultz's speech in February at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco. There are four points; all of them have to be satisfied before a war America is financing could be called off and one of them is they must live up to their commitment to democratic pluralism. They must be allowing the opposition to participate in the political processes of the country.

It is simply bizarre for South Africa's great friends to say that one of our conditions for stopping armed attacks on the Nicaraguan Government is that they let the people of Nicara-

gua have more rights when they support a South African Government that totally represses them.

The government, yes, talked about the business sector. Well, if you are black in South Africa you cannot even be an employee in much of your own country. You cannot be in certain businesses.

Yes; progress is coming. They are now about to say, we are told, that if two people of different race make the mistake of feeling an affection for each other, and want through some church to regularize that and become married to each other, that may no longer be a crime. That is the degree of moral barbarism we are dealing with and that we support in many ways by economic relations.

Let me just talk about the strategic question. The administration would genuinely believe, they would have us believe, I guess, that they are opposed equally to what goes on in both places. I would think almost anybody objectively would find South Africa—

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I will get to the gentleman in a moment.

At this point I would read into the RECORD some extraneous material from an article by Gregory Nokes of the AP. And he says: "President Reagan says the struggle against the Sandinista Government of Nicaragua is one of the 'greatest moral challenges' since World War II, but critics say the greater challenge, about which Reagan says little, is in South Africa."

"The President speaks out forcefully and frequently against Nicaragua, but only seldom criticizes South Africa. Yet there is little disagreement that the mistreatment of South Africa's 22 million blacks by the white minority is much harsher than the human rights abuses of the leftist Sandinistas."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include this entire article.

The article referred to follows:

REAGAN SAYS NICARAGUA A "MORAL CHALLENGE" BUT QUIET ON SOUTH AFRICA: AN AP NEWS ANALYSIS

(By R. Gregory Nokes)

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan says the struggle against the Sandinista government of Nicaragua is one of the "greatest moral challenges" since World War II, but critics say the greater challenge, about which Reagan says little, is in South Africa.

The President speaks out forcefully and frequently against Nicaragua, but only seldom criticizes South Africa. Yet there is little disagreement that the mistreatment of South Africa's 22 million blacks by the white minority is much harsher than the human rights abuses of the leftist Sandinistas.

Reagan has accused the Sandinistas of "institutionalized cruelty," alleging brutality toward the Miskito Indian population; suppression, torture and abuse of political opponents, and of using a "scorched earth" policy to force the relocation of tens of thousands of peasants.

Yet South Africa, the only government to make racial discrimination official government policy, routinely destroys homes of blacks, and has forced millions to live on reservations known as homelands. Blacks have no vote and no right to protest. Several hundred blacks have been killed in recent months by police who fired on demonstrations, while dozens of black leaders have been jailed on unspecified charges.

Reagan's approach to the two countries reflects his concern that Nicaragua is going Communist, while South Africa is considered an anti-Communist bastion in Africa. But it's a shortsighted policy that will reap its own ill harvest, say critics.

Rep. Howard Wolpe, D-Mich., chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa, said the administration fails to "understand that South Africa itself is an open invitation to communism."

"Our identification with this kind of regime is actually increasing the dependence of liberation movements in the region on the Soviets and the Cubans," he said.

Randall Robinson, who has organized daily demonstrations outside the South African Embassy here, said the administration errs by focusing exclusively on strategic objectives. "Moral concerns of the deprivation of human rights don't have the slightest consideration," he said.

He said the administration is doing nothing in its policies to head off a possible "blood bath" in South Africa.

But Secretary of State George P. Shultz, speaking at a National Press Club luncheon Tuesday, expressed sharp opposition to a proposal before Congress that would ban new U.S. investment and reduce trade ties. He said the United States "must not throw American matches on the emotional tinder of the region."

He also said conditions are improving, although critics say recent changes are only cosmetic and don't get at the substance of apartheid, which is the denial of any political power to the black majority.

In one of his rare criticisms of South Africa, after 19 black demonstrators were killed by police last month, Reagan said the apartheid practices of the government are "repugnant."

He has said he doesn't criticize South Africa more often because it is "counter-productive for one country to splash itself all over the headlines demanding that another country do something . . . It can't appear to be rolling over at the demands of outsiders."

There is no reluctance to criticize Nicaragua, however, which Reagan said wants "to spread its poison throughout this free and increasingly democratic hemisphere."

"We cannot have the United States walk away from one of the greatest moral challenges in postwar history," he said Monday night in a speech aimed at persuading a reluctant Congress to approve \$14 million in new aid for anti-government guerrillas, known as Contras.

Reagan says the Contras—organized and trained by the Central Intelligence Agency—are freedom fighters worthy of the help that the United States traditionally gives to peoples struggling for freedom. The Contras have received \$80 million from the administration since 1981, but a much older black guerrilla movement in South Africa receives neither Reagan's praise nor American aid.

Wolpe said in an interview that racial attitudes may be a factor in American foreign policy.

"It is hard to escape the possibility that our hang-ups about race in our own society have helped to shape our very different way we respond to the struggle for freedom and dignity in South Africa, in contrast with our easy identification with comparable struggles elsewhere in the world against communist or totalitarian rule," he said.

Chester A. Crocker, the assistant secretary of state for African affairs who helped forge the administration's policy of so-called "constructive engagement," said in an interview it is misleading to compare South Africa with Nicaragua.

"South Africa is not a communist country, for God's sake," he said. "South Africa is not our enemy."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—R. Gregory Nokes covers diplomatic matters for The Associated Press and has been writing about the administration's policy toward Central America since 1981.)

Mr. FRANK. What is it that keeps them from speaking out against South Africa?

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. Not at this time. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. RITTER. The gentleman is a great engager in other special orders.

Mr. FRANK. I have not yielded, so I do not know why the gentleman is speaking. I will get to him. We have about 40 minutes left and I promise that I will be glad to let the gentleman speak. I just want to develop the argument.

I want to quote Secretary Shultz. Certainly my friend on the other side would not object to my quoting Secretary Shultz.

Secretary Shultz said yesterday in a quote as to why we cannot fight against South Africa too hard, why we have to be constructively engaged in South Africa: "A society that feels immensely threatened by outside forces is less likely to loosen the controls at home."

Now if you are seriously trying to get the Nicaraguan Government to be more democratic, you do that. Let me put it this way: You make the Nicaraguan Government being more democratic by financing a war against them. But in South Africa, you do not rise your voice too loudly because if they feel threatened by outside forces, they are less likely to loosen the controls at home.

And here is Secretary Shultz again:

We cannot have it both ways. We cannot have influence with people if we treat them as moral lepers, especially when they are themselves beginning to address the agenda of change.

We must not treat the South Africans as moral lepers, but we can shoot the Nicaraguans because that will bring them to change. But we cannot criticize too harshly South Africa. That is the kind of incredible use of language to cause there to be no credibility for the President's program. That is what we wanted to focus on.

Let me read just one last final quote from Chester A. Crocker, the Assistant

Secretary of State of African Affairs. This is in January of 1985 that it was printed, but he said it in September. An Assistant Secretary of State over at the State Department talking about how we would like change in South Africa. He says:

Americans reject instinctively scenarios that would have us instigate revolutionary violence and racial strife in that country . . .

Apparently violence without racial strife is OK, but revolutionary violence and racial strife with violence we cannot have.

Our goals can only be reached through a sustained process of peaceful evolutionary change. We remain opposed to the resort to violence from whatever quarter; the fruits of political violence in the world today are bitter reminders of what terrorism and counterterrorism can mean.

This is not coming from Mike Farrell or from opponents of the President's policy or the National Council of Churches. This is the Assistant Secretary of State of the United States of America explaining our policy in South Africa.

We remain opposed to the resort to violence from whatever quarter. [We] reject instinctively scenarios that would have us instigate revolutionary violence and racial strife . . .

. . . the fruits of political violence in the world today are bitter reminders of what terrorism and counterterrorism can mean . . .

As someone who is unhappy with the Sandinistas' lack of democracy, how in the name of anything rational can you say these things and then finance in the name of democracy in part a \$14 million first installment on a war?

Mr. DYMALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I have an appointment with the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and I trust that I will take this matter up with him, too.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any issue that is more pressing in the world today than the question of the racist regime in South Africa. I join with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and my colleague from Texas [Mr. LELAND] in expressing my indignation over the situation in South Africa and the failure of this administration to move forcibly against the racist regime.

I conclude by saying this: I take very strong exception as an American to the fact that the President referred to the Contras in Nicaragua as freedom fighters but then blame the freedom fighters in South Africa for fighting for their rights and lay the blame on the whole unrest there on the freedom fighters. And as a black, I take strong exception to the Secretary of State re-

ferring to these Contras in Nicaragua as brothers. Brother is a term of endearment born out of the civil rights movement for the struggle for justice and democracy, and it seems to me it is a double standard that points out the hypocrisy of this administration's efforts in South Africa.

I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] for calling this special order and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I now yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think there is some difference between the situation in South Africa and Nicaragua. I am not here in any way to defend apartheid or the policies of the South African Government. But I would like to call my colleague's attention to certain situations that have occurred in the last 15 years around the country, around the world, whereby authoritarian regimes have made the transition to democracy. For example, Greece under the colonels eventually went democratic. We did not sponsor a war of national liberation, of violent upheaval in Greece. We, to some extent, worked with the Greek Government, worked with the traditional forces within the society, traditional forces like the business community, traditional forces like the church, traditional forces engaged in political opposition that was not totally destroyed.

I think the same can be said of Spain under Franco. When Franco died, Spain made a transition to democratic rule.

Recently, in South America, there has been a spate of nations which having formerly been authoritarian made the transition to democratic rule. Argentina recently, not too long ago, was under the dictatorship of the Generals. We did not go into Argentina and support the Montenegro leftist guerrillas. We worked to some extent with a system; we supported those institutions and those traditions within the government.

□ 1620

Mr. FRANK. I will take back my time for just a second in order to ask the gentleman a question: As I understand it he is giving all these instances when we have refrained from financing an armed rebellion against an undemocratic society. Do I take it he is about to announce against funding the Contras? I am just curious.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. No. I am trying to make the distinction, if the gentleman



would continue to yield, and I do appreciate his yielding, I am trying to make a distinction between some of these undesirable authoritarian regimes on the right which have had the seeds of transition to more democratic societies.

For example, we have worked with the Korean Government and strides have been made towards opening up the Korean political system, as recent elections show. They have a long way to go to become a United States-style democracy, there is no doubt about it. But nobody is interested in foisting a North Korean type of war of national liberation on them.

Brazil, Uruguay have recently made the transition from authorization rightwing regimes to democratic systems.

Mr. FRANK. I am going to take back my time in order to make a point briefly. Let me say to the gentleman I understand and I agree to all that.

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. FRANK. No, the rules are such that the gentleman may speak when I yield to him. Under the gentleman's special order I may speak when he yields to me. But I simply want to set the ground rules.

The point is simply this. I only have an hour and there are other Members who want to speak.

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRANK. I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, to please abide by the rules. I would be glad to continue to yield if the gentleman would abide by the rules of the House. I do not write the rules of the House, I only vote for them.

Mr. RITTER. Well, may I sum up my point?

Mr. FRANK. No; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman briefly, but I will not if we cannot abide by the rules of the House. I do not think it is possible—

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. FRANK. I will yield in a few minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] controls the time.

Mr. FRANK. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if he wants to give this list, and I agree with him, and I think it was a wise thing that we did in some cases. When Raul Alfonsín became President of Argentina winning a democratic election, I was very proud that he had Pat Derian who was Assistant Secretary for Human Rights in the Carter administration, to be at his inauguration because he said if it had not been for her and the kind of pressure she had brought on that regime that preceded him, he might have not lived even to run. And I agree that we can do that. My point is that

it is not relevant to the issues we are talking about today because we are talking about South Africa.

I would reject the suggestion that there is in this explicitly racist regime of South Africa anything that really resembles what has gone on in Argentina and Greece.

There is, I think, a qualitative difference with the people who say—you see the problem we had with these other nations was this: the Greeks, the Franco regime, they said democracy is no good. We have something in South Africa where they say "Oh, democracy is wonderful." The people who run South Africa, the white South Africans say democracy is the only legitimate form of government "for us human beings. But for you black people, you don't count and you don't get this." Therefore I am rejecting the gentleman's analogy. The fact that the Greek Government did move, I do not think the South African Government is going to move. On the other hand I would also point out to the gentleman that we are not here arguing and let me make this clear, the gentleman from Texas, myself, the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY], we are not arguing for the Reagan policy of Nicaragua to be transferred to South Africa. We are not here suggesting that not \$14 million but a proportionate amount would be \$50 million or \$60 million, be given to armed resistance by the African National Congress.

We are not here suggesting that you finance armed revolt against the South African Government. We are saying that to finance armed revolt against Nicaraguans and say democracy is one of the reasons, they do not say it is the only one, but to count that at all and then to say "We can't even yell at the South Africans" I think is inconsistent.

So I would say to the gentleman what he said is not relevant to the argument here.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

First of all we are fighting, that is we are supporting wars of national liberation, in Afghanistan.

Mr. FRANK. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. A wide cross-section of this Congress, the committee at least, has supported aid through Thailand for the San Son resistance in Cambodia. And I think the reason is that there has not been any kind of authoritarian government's transition to a democracy other than in Grenada which was done by force. I think it is a realization that there simply is no movement of Communist totalitarian governments toward more liberal forms of government and that the people who are willing to take up arms

on behalf of democratic principles perhaps deserve some support.

Mr. FRANK. Let me take back my time to ask the gentleman a question and I will yield to him. He has not yet said and none of his arguments make any sense unless he is about to tell us that the South African Government is in fact going to move. I do not see any sign that if you follow the Reagan policies of constructive engagement, of not being rude to them, blaming some of the rioters for getting shot as the President did—

Mr. RITTER. I am not supporting that.

Mr. FRANK. Right. I would agree with some of the examples that the gentleman gave but the point is they are not available to defend the Reagan policy in South Africa.

The point is simply this. The gentleman is making arguments about other countries. We are talking about South Africa. Let me be very explicit: When George Shultz says, "We are so concerned about the censorship of La Prensa, it distresses me so to see a newspaper censored that I am going to finance a revolution against the people who censor it," when he then turns around and says, "but with regard to South Africa if you make someone a moral leper then you can't have any influence." What I am saying is it is not true, the Secretary of State and others who say that, including the President, are speaking an untruth to the American people when they say that the Nicaraguan policy is motivated in part by concern over internal democracy.

The South African example and their own rhetoric belies that. Now yes, there are other countries that have moved. As far as South Africa is concerned, let me say that I have seen more movement in behalf of some far-left countries. Let us take one of the President's best friends right now, the People's Republic of China. He has great relations with them. There have been some movement, more liberalization, more improvement from the Mao days to the Deng Xiaoping days today in China than in South Africa. So while I agree with what the gentleman has said that we have not seen democracy come to any of those Communist countries, we have seen, if you are going to take South Africa, we have seen the lot of a Chinese citizen today is better economically and politically in terms of liberalization than it was under Mao. For the South Africans it has gotten worse. They have even lost the right of living in their own country. The South African Government in the most cosmetic way talks nice and in fact is getting worse and more brutal. I am simply saying that the argument that the gentleman makes while it is historically of great inter-

est, it is irrelevant to the argument here.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas at this time.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to Mr. RITTER and some of the observations that he has made.

What I do not understand is the logic of his argument because if you lay out the foundation for the history the gentleman has given then in fact we ought to be supporting the South African liberation fighters or the true freedom fighters there for the liberation of the majority of the people in South Africa, financially and otherwise.

Mr. RITTER. I would like to respond to that.

Mr. LELAND. All we are trying to say in this discussion, if you will, is that if, in fact, President Reagan can make so many statements that are favorable toward the Contras in Nicaragua, then those statements ought to be truly, in many instances or in most instances I venture to say, those statements ought to be made more so about the people who are struggling for freedom in South Africa.

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I think what one can see in South Africa that is similar, for example, to some of the other countries that made the transition, not that South Africa is that close to transition, but there is an independent church, there is an independent business community, there is an independent intellectual community and academic community. These are the seeds that eventually can, if one works with them, make the transition.

Mr. FRANK. I would ask the gentleman this question: for black people?

Mr. RITTER. Just one second, please. The Chinese experience, yes, there is liberalization in China but if anyone thinks the Chinese people have anything regarding any kind of freedom that even existed in Greece under the colonels, I think that is stretching it.

The fact about Nicaragua is that it is on our southern border. The fact about Nicaragua is that it does not—

Mr. FRANK. I have to take back my time for a second because the gentleman said Nicaragua was on our southern border. Has he misplaced a few countries? What happened to like Mexico and Panama, not Panama but the others above it? Nicaragua is not on our southern border.

Mr. RITTER. Nicaragua is very close to the southern border of the United States.

Mr. FRANK. I will give the gentleman "close."

Mr. RITTER. There is no way one can consider it on the southern border, it is not literally on the southern border.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I will let the gentleman from Pennsylvania finish if I may.

□ 1630

Mr. RITTER. I guess my point about Nicaragua is, it is one of these totalitarian communist governments. There are people who are willing to take up arms. If you look at the number, 15,000 in a small country of 2½ million, that is like 1.5 million Americans. They say that with the proper material and supplies, 25,000 people would take up arms.

Mr. FRANK. I have to ask the gentleman a question. I want to take back my time to ask the gentleman a question, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

In the first place, I did not suggest that China today has freedom. I said there has been more advance for the Chinese peasant from Mao to Deng—

Mr. RITTER. It is because—

Mr. FRANK. I must remind the gentleman that he has to wait for me to yield. Those are the rules we all live by; the gentleman can take out a special order and I will participate there, but we do have to have rules in the House.

The point is this: I simply said that there has been an improvement for the average Chinese that was greater than the improvement for a black in South Africa. I think there has been slippage in the other direction.

I did not say that they had any of those real freedoms. As a matter of fact, it is the Reagan administration that is the great booster of the People's Republic of China—I do not think I have been quite as enthused as the President about some of these things; in fact, I have been critical of the Reagan administration's failure to allow political asylum-seekers from the People's Republic of China into America. I think the State Department has behaved badly in rejecting the asylum application because of the President's political tie-in there.

But I want to get back to the gentleman when he suggests that there is for black people in South Africa, independent business, and an independent intellectual community.

I have to disagree when the gentleman suggests that black people in South Africa today are allowed those basic freedoms. They are not even allowed in many cases to live in certain parts of their own country.

So the suggestion that the black people of South Africa have that kind of independence, I think, is simply wrong.

Does the gentleman want me to yield to him, or his reinforcement?

Mr. RITTER. I would just like to say, I do not believe that there is the

great level of independence of blacks in South Africa, but one also must admit that blacks do migrate into South Africa from other black African ruled nations.

Mr. FRANK. And what is the relevance of that?

Mr. RITTER. Excuse me?

Mr. FRANK. Is that in any way a justification or anything relevant—I must say that disturbs me, that suggestion.

Mr. RITTER. There are certain economic—

Mr. FRANK. I want to get back to the point that I was asking. The gentleman suggested that South Africa today resembles Greece. The gentleman said that Nicaragua is a totalitarian regime, and suggested it for the blacks in South Africa. For the whites in South Africa, it is a great place to live; no heavy lifting, because the blacks do it for you.

But in the situation for black people, I would argue that it is far worse than it was for the people of Nicaragua; there is much less freedom for the blacks, and I would reject the notion that there is the basis for black people to be at all hopeful about this regime in South Africa.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. What I am trying to say is, there are institutions today in South Africa which do not agree with apartheid. There is an independent church which is diametrically opposed to apartheid. There is a press which is opposed in part, which is opposed to apartheid. There are academic institutions, there are business organizations which have gone several steps to enforce celibate principles within their own confines to oppose the system of apartheid.

Mr. FRANK. Reclaiming my time, I want to respond to the gentleman's I think excessive justification of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the time.

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman should understand. He talks about an independent church in South Africa. Well, there is an independent church in Nicaragua.

You might say, "Well, the church in Nicaragua faces harassment." The churches in South Africa face persecution and harassment that is far worse.

In South Africa they have indicted white churchmen as well as black churchmen. Roman Catholic churchmen have been indicted in South Africa—I do not think that there have been high ranking Roman Catholic churchmen subjected to the kind of police procedures in Nicaragua that they have been in South Africa.



So the argument that because there is an independent church in Nicaragua, they are better off; the South African Catholic Church has been very shabbily treated and persecuted by this government.

I yield first to the gentleman from Texas and then to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me, and let me direct my comments to the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and let him know that I have a certain empathy for the people of South Africa, because my roots lie somewhere in the Continent of Africa, and because of the brutality that was committed to the black people who were brought here, in terms of our cutting off our roots, we cannot trace back precisely where we came from.

Let me suggest to you that I am very happy to be an American citizen today, because I can stand here and argue with you on the issue apartheid in South Africa whereas there is not a black person in the parliament of South Africa who can argue for the people they would represent, given the opportunity to get elected.

They cannot get elected, not only because they are disallowed from representation for the people who are in the majority in South Africa, but they cannot even vote. They do not even have a vote.

What kind of persecution is that? You talk very cavalierly about what is going on in South Africa. There is nothing cavalier about the fact that people, black people, are relegated to townships, shanty towns, if you will, because white people do not want them to be a part of their social life or their political or economic life.

They do not gain any benefit from being a South African citizen and now they have gotten this incredible scheme where they would cordon off land for the so-called black workers in South Africa and give them that land and let them call that a township.

They have absolutely no rights to participate in society in South Africa at all. What is done in Nicaragua is not comparable to what has gone on in South Africa. How long has the Sandinista government been in power?

Let us also review the history of Nicaragua. What kind of rights did the people under Somoza have? What kind?

I think that the gentleman must understand that what is happening in South Africa now is that things have, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has suggested, have gotten much, much worse.

Anytime the black people get together in groups now, they are subject to being killed. Not just incarcerated or put under house arrest, but now they are fearful of their lives, just for

going to a funeral. Just for peacefully demonstrating.

What kind of situation is that? How can we justify our continued involvement? How can we accept the very pedestrian attitude on the part of the Secretary of State of this country to say that in fact those people in South Africa might get a little shaky, the rulers of South Africa might get a little shaky if we push too hard?

Mr. FRANK. I will reclaim my time for a second. I just want to add to the comments of my friend from Texas. He is perplexed, and he wants to know how we can do that. Let me explain. Let me give him the Reagan doctrine on this. It comes from Secretary for Human Rights Abrams—he is the human rights expert.

He says, he might as well have been listening here and wanted to say this to the gentleman from Texas when he talks about people being shot down at funerals:

We must recognize that we are dealing with another sovereign nation. And by no means the only country in the world to abuse human rights. We cannot dictate to that nation's leaders how to conduct their internal affairs.

That is the justification for nonintervention in South Africa. But with Nicaragua, because they have censored the press and have not had elections that we fully approve of, we can finance a revolution against them.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been a part of this entire discussion; I watched some of it on television in my office. Let me say, I essentially agree with the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Massachusetts about the situation in South Africa.

I specifically agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts about the stupidity of the remarks of the Secretary of State. I do not want to get into that argument, particularly, but it seems to me that what we are—where I will disagree with both of the gentlemen is that the situation in Nicaragua is nowhere comparable to the situation in South Africa.

In my judgment, all the elements of the same kind of oppression, if not in degree, but the same kind of oppression are existent in Sandinista Nicaragua that exist in South Africa. There is oppression of the church by the Sandinista government. The archbishop has had his car destroyed twice; once with him in it by the Tour Bus Divinas organized by the Sandinista government; Father Pina has been stripped and beaten by Sandinista soldiers; the Sandinista government has expelled all the foreign priests working with the traditional church and kept only the priests working with the so-called popular church.

So there are elements of religious repression. Even the elements of the resettlement program that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] so eloquently pointed out, one of the major human rights violations on the planet which is taking place right now in South Africa, but there is even an element of that in Nicaragua, as 3,000 to 4,000 families in the Montegulpa Province and the other northern areas of the country are being relocated by the Sandinista government, having their families torn apart.

□ 1640

In my judgment, if there is a difference in degree between Nicaragua and South Africa, it is only because the Sandinistas have not had a sufficient amount of time to entrench the totalitarian nature of their state.

Mr. FRANK. I will take my time back now. The gentleman has made his statement. I will take my time back, and I want to make one point clear. We were not here, essentially, arguing that particular point. What we were saying was this: The gentleman said he is willing to concede, I guess, that South Africa, for black people, is maybe a degree or two worse than Nicaragua.

Mr. WEBER. I just said it is worse. I did not say a degree or two. I said it is worse.

Mr. FRANK. All right. The gentleman concedes that South Africa is worse than Nicaragua. Now he thinks if you give Nicaragua time, they may overturn them. The point we are making is this: We are addressing that part of the Reagan administration's justification for making war on Nicaragua which says we are concerned about democracy.

If you want to argue the other point, you can. What I am saying is—

Mr. WEBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. No; I have not yielded yet, because I want to get back on the point. The point we are making is this—

Mr. WEBER. I am trying to address the point.

Mr. FRANK. Well, then get a special order and address it.

The point is, the administration has said that one of the moral justifications for making war on Nicaragua with American money is their lack of democracy. At the same time it has said with regard to South Africa:

You can't expect the government to change. They are a sovereign nation. If we push too hard, they will rebel against us. That is not the way to do it.

What we are saying is, it is hypocritical for a government to make excuses for not pressing very hard against South Africa. And I admired the letter that the gentleman and others on his side of the aisle sent to

the South African Government. I thought it was an important letter. I wish it reflected administration policy.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the No. 1 defender of apartheid in America today, as I remember him from his statements in the columns he wrote, he is now the Director of Communications, Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Buchanan has basically defended apartheid. He is in the White House. That is the policy we have today.

What we are saying is, this administration, if they want to persuade us that 3 million poorly organized people in Nicaragua are a threat to this great superpower, let them do it on that basis. But let them not try to invoke democratic principles, because when the gentleman agrees South Africa is, if anything, even worse, even if they are both unfortunate, where do you get any justification for saying, given the South African policy, that one of the reasons we are making war on Nicaragua is democracy?

The speech says there were four conditions. One of the Secretary of State's and President's conditions for calling off the war is the lack of democracy. Well, if we were to go to war against everybody in part on that basis, I think we would be bankrupt.

I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I impose on my colleague quite reluctantly, but only because the gentleman that you just yielded to before on the other side has made a grievous misstatement of truth and fact, and I would like at this point to provide, if the gentleman agrees with this unanimous-consent request, a reply to this question of so-called religious persecution in Nicaragua, by Rev. William Callahan, who is here now in the Washington area but has worked and lived in Nicaragua for many, many years, and I just want to state at this point the categorical answer that he makes to this, in view of the fact that the President had talked quite insincerely, I think, about using the hierarchy as sort of a medium of reconciliation.

"The Roman Catholic bishops, as a whole," in Nicaragua, "have taken a strong adversarial position toward the Sandinista party and toward the newly elected Nicaraguan Government. They are not perceived as impartial either inside Nicaragua or internationally . . ."

"The struggle between the bishops and the Nicaraguan Government is essentially political, not religious; that is, a struggle over 'turfs,' not over religious freedom," which has been one of the long-associated historical dilemmas in the Latin American countries, beginning with Mexico and proceeding on south.

Many religious opponents of the Nicaraguan Government suggest that Nicaragua will become "another Cuba."

Exactly the opposite has happened. The very opposite. In Cuba, the churches were restricted to the churches and the religious practitioners restricted to the churches, they have been closed, to all intents and purposes, religious schools have been closed, the Catholic Church had fought Castro, lost, and has been sharply reduced in scope and influence.

Exactly the opposite is true after 6 years in power of the so-called Sandinista regime. "Churches of all denominations enjoy freedom of worship. The churches are vigorous." The Nicaraguans are a highly religious people, "as witnessed in the public activity of those supporting the revolution and those opposing it. Religious schools are flourishing, and the intrachurch debates are vigorous."

Fourth, "the struggle in Nicaragua is not only between the government and the bishops but within the church community, i.e., between Catholics who oppose the revolution and those powerful segments of the Catholic community that support the revolution."

Mr. FRANK. I will just say to my friend from Texas that unfortunately I only have 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thought it would be appropriate to put that in.

Mr. FRANK. I appreciate it. I hope it will be inserted. But I did want to have time to yield a little bit to my two friends. Let me go to my friend from Minnesota first and then to my friend from California. I will keep about a minute for myself.

Mr. WEBER. Let me just ask my colleague, the gentleman from Texas had a unanimous consent request. I do not want to interrupt the free flow of debate, but I hope the gentleman is not going to insert at this point in the Record massive volumes of materials, because if he is going to do that, I would like to do the same thing to hold out my point of view. I would hope that the gentleman would agree with me that neither of us would go messing up their special order with all sorts of unanimous-consent requests at this time.

Mr. FRANK. Well, the gentleman from Minnesota will not be surprised if the gentleman from Texas has his own special order.

Mr. WEBER. I am sure that he does. Mr. FRANK. And he will put in whatever he thinks is appropriate.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will not go into this at any great length. I will just say that in my visit to that part of the world I explored more than any other question the question of the situation of the Catholic Church.

Mr. FRANK. Which part of the world, South Africa or Nicaragua?

Mr. WEBER. Both in El Salvador and in Nicaragua, not in South Africa.

Mr. FRANK. Not in South Africa.

Mr. WEBER. And I disagree with the conclusions of the gentleman from Texas. We were told by Archbishop Obando y Bravo that over 860 priests in Nicaragua remained loyal to the traditional church and only 10 Nicaraguan priests and 40 foreign priests are loyal to the so-called popular church.

Furthermore, the popular church, which does not attract very large crowds at Sunday mass when we were there at that time, is subsidized heavily by the government. Half a million dollars went to the center which subsidizes the popular church and the Sandinista government. Let me just conclude, and then I will give your time back.

Mr. FRANK. I just wanted to ask the gentleman, because that is not basically my point, I wanted to ask him, does he think that the fact that a church is mistreated, which I greatly deplore, is an independent reason for America to finance an armed assault on the government that does it? Because I think the South African Government mistreats its churches as badly and in many cases worse, with indictments and persecutions, as Nicaragua. So I am not here to say that these things do not happen, simply that it is hypocritical for this administration to advance that as an independent reason for attack.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. One, I am responding to the gentleman from Texas, who took specific issue with my comments. Two, I do not think in and of itself that the nature of religious freedom in any country is reason for us to justify the overthrow of that government. However, the nature of religious freedom in the country of Nicaragua, to the extent which it exists and the attitude the government takes toward it, together with other facts we know about that government, are substantial evidence of the nature of that government and should be brought to bear in the debate.

Mr. FRANK. I have to take back my time. Yes; they are evidence of the nature of the government. The point the gentleman from Texas and I are making is this: It is hypocritical to be South Africa's best friend—I do not mean the gentleman from Minnesota, who has been very good on this subject of South Africa—it is hypocritical for this administration to be South Africa's friend and say we cannot pressure them politically and then find a lack of democracy as any part of the justification for an assault on Nicaragua. If they want to justify the American people taking scarce dollars to encourage people to kill each other in Nicaragua, they better find some other reason than that they are concerned about democracy, because as



South Africa's friend, as Marcos' friend, as the friend of so many other dictators, right and left, the People's Republic of China, when was the last time they pressured them for democracy?

Mr. LELAND. Chile, Mr. Pinochet in Chile.

Mr. FRANK. Chile, which is far more oppressive, right in our own hemisphere. It simply will not wash for them to invoke democracy, and it degrades the debate for them to pretend.

Let me yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To get back to the gentleman's original point, I think the gentleman has made a good case for inconsistency here manifest in the statements of Mr. Shultz and others in the administration. My question for the gentleman is, because it appeared to me that the gentleman was saying that he agrees that the Sandinistas do pose—at least there is an argument to be made for a military threat and that they are, in many cases, as bad as the South Africans—

Mr. FRANK. No; let me just say to the gentleman that I disagree with their internal policies, I think they are undemocratic; I am not afraid of the Sandinistas because Nicaragua is a small, rather poor country. I would be inclined, as a citizen of Massachusetts, to be more afraid of Connecticut than I am of Nicaragua, because they have a better industrial base. But the point I would make is that I am critical of their lack of democracy, I am not frightened of them. And I am not a big tough guy, this is not a macho act, it is just geopolitics.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. My question is simply this: Does the gentleman feel—because the Contra vote obviously is coming up, and the gentleman has not indicated how he is going to vote on that. Does the gentleman feel that there is enough of a proxy Soviet presence there in Nicaragua or a potential presence, satellite presence, to be a threat on the magnitude of Cuba?

Mr. FRANK. I will take 1 minute, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

No; in the first place, if it were a threat of the magnitude of Cuba, I suppose we would have to go and invade Cuba too, and I think that disproves the gentleman's point. If it is a Cuba-type threat, if it is a proxy for Cuba, what do you get by doing away with the proxy when the real thing is still there just a few miles away?

I do not think that America should be the 911 of civil liberties, every time people repress their citizens you dial 911, out comes Bill Casey and \$50 million and a comic book about how to murder people and blow up their toi-

lets. I think that is a great waste. I am not afraid of Nicaragua. I think we can say, as a majority of both parties of this House said, we are prepared to support policies that interdict the shipment of arms elsewhere, but I am not for invading them, and I am for an equivalent policy, I am not for funding the African National Congress, I am not for making war on South Africa, I am for the kinds of economic sanctions in South Africa I think would help.

I will yield, to finish up, to the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1650

Mr. LELAND. I would just like to ask the gentleman if, on the premise that we have involved ourselves and the way that we have as a Government in Nicaragua, should not we attack the Soviet Union right now since in fact we are worried about their involvement? I mean, that is exactly what the parameters of the discussion happen to be. That is what the gentleman is suggesting.

Mr. FRANK. I say to my friend from Texas: Please do not give them any ideas.

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for reserving this special order on the Reagan administration's constructive engagement approach toward the South African Government. The President would have us to believe that this approach is the key to changing the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. That is not the case.

The American news media depicts almost daily the mounting injustices, senseless killings, and horrors that are a part of the everyday life of the 22.7 million black South Africans. Although they comprise the majority of the population, blacks in South Africa, virtually have no political, economic, or social power. The majority is ruled by the minority—4.7 million white South Africans. White South Africans can vote. Black South Africans cannot. For every \$1 a white employee earns, a black earns 22 cents.

Mr. Speaker, while the United States simply watches, the grand scheme of apartheid to establish satellite black townships where blacks are relegated and robbed of their homeland is in full swing. Institutional discrimination and overt racism are the law of the land. Violence and unjustified killings by government police against unarmed black South Africans are on the increase.

"Constructive engagement" will not change this situation. In fact, the Reagan administration approach may worsen it. Constructive engagement has lulled the white ruling South Afri-

can Government into actually believing that apartheid can survive.

The Reagan administration's approach is a simplistic response to a complex problem. It is also a comfortable position for the United States. Over 300 American corporations conduct business in South Africa. South Africa's minerals are imported, in large quantities, into the United States. And, South Africa is a major ally of the United States in that part of the globe.

It is a tough decision. But, leaders of this Nation, the self-proclaimed champion of the oppressed around the globe, must take a firm stand on the side of justice in South Africa. Constructive engagement is not the answer. Only swift and effective action by the American Government will push the South African ruling minority government to review and abolish the apartheid system.

Mr. Speaker, the Anti-Apartheid Act, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman BILL GRAY, is a good first step. The bill prohibits American businesses from making new investments in or loans to South Africa. The bill further prohibits the sale in this country of the gold South African Krugerrand coin and sets forth steps from the sanctions to be lifted.

The Anti-Apartheid Act is tough action, not meaningless talk like the Reagan administration constructive engagement approach. The American Government must act, decisively, before it is too late in South Africa. ●

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to sponsor H.R. 1460, the anti-Apartheid Act of 1985, which was introduced on March 7, 1985. For several years now, along with many like-minded colleagues in the House of Representatives, I have sought to enact legislation to limit American economic and political relations with South Africa and to express our commitment to see the policy of apartheid eradicated. Such legislation passed the House of Representatives last year, but unfortunately died in the Senate in the last hours of the session. Nonetheless, in the ensuing months advocates of sanctions have been encouraged and renewed by the demonstrations of concern and commitment by thousands of Americans on this issue, and we are pleased to reintroduce the South Africa sanctions bill for passage during the current session of Congress.

Virtually all Americans would agree that South Africa's apartheid system is incompatible with democratic principles and human rights. Any system of government which excludes by definition the overwhelming majority of people who live in that country merely because of the color of their skin is a system of government that we would

find fundamentally objectionable. The question we confront in the Congress is not how to assess apartheid, but how to respond to it.

The answer advanced by the Reagan administration is a policy known as a constructive engagement, grounded in the belief, as Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker has said, "that it is not our task to choose between black and white." After 4 years, the verdict is in on the constructive engagement approach. It is a flawed and failed policy, a monument to moral myopia and wishful thinking. It has caused South Africa neither to relax its racist repression at home, nor to end its control of Namibia in defiance of international law. Meanwhile, the United States is paying an increasingly heavy price, with the black majority in South Africa, with other African nations, and even with some of our Western allies, for a policy which is often perceived as a reapproachment with racism.

Clearly, it is now time to abandon constructive engagement and bring forward a new approach, one which makes clear in deed as well as word our abhorrence of apartheid. It is time to develop a policy in which we choose not between black and white, but between justice and injustice. In designing and executing such a policy, we should cast aside any illusions that our actions will bring the apartheid system to its knees. In the final analysis, a political resolution of South Africa's problems must come from within South Africa, not from the United States or any other outside nation. At the same time, there are a number of steps we could take which would have a significant symbolic and substantive impact upon events in South Africa. Several of those steps are embodied in the legislation that was introduced on March 7, 1985. The bill has four parts: First, a ban on loans by U.S. banks to the South African Government or its parastatal entities, except for loans made for educational, housing, and health facilities which are available on a totally nondiscriminatory basis in areas open to all population groups; second, no new investment by American companies in South Africa; third, a ban on the importation into the United States of the South African krugerrand or any other gold coin minted by the South African Government; and fourth, a ban on the sales of computers (which are used to enforce apartheid) to the South African Government.

Critics of the legislation contended that it is wrong to single out South Africa for special condemnation when there are so many other human rights violators around the world. But the fact is that for a variety of reasons the United States has adopted stringent measures against other nations—restrictions which have frequently been

more sweeping than those proposed in this bill. For example, in 1978 we enacted a total economic embargo on trade with Uganda. Under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, the United States maintains an embargo on economic transactions with Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, and North Korea and implemented an embargo against Iran during the hostage crisis. Under the United Nations Participation Act, we carried out extensive economic sanctions against the white minority government of Rhodesia for many years. The Export Administration Act contains other provisions under which exports to South Africa and many other nations are controlled or restricted on grounds of short supply, national security, anti-terrorism, human rights, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and other foreign policy considerations.

Given the actions we have taken against other human rights violators, I believe our Nation would be more open to a charge of inconsistency and selective indignation in our foreign policy if we failed to enact this legislation. If we believe human rights to be a valid and important consideration in our foreign policy, it would seem to be particularly inappropriate to carry on business as usual with the apartheid regime. While all forms of dictatorship and tyranny are objectionable, there is something especially repulsive about a system of tyranny based on the doctrine of racial exclusion because that idea strikes in a very fundamental and insidious way at the dignity of human beings.

I believe it is now up to the Congress to point us toward a fundamentally different course in our relations with South Africa, a course which serves both our sense of national purpose and our national interest, which is consistent with our own commitment to individual freedom and recognizes the reality of eventual majority rule in that nation.●

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this special order on the lack of firm action by the Reagan administration against the practice of apartheid by the South African Government.

On taking office in 1981, the Reagan administration formulated the policy of constructive engagement to encourage peaceful change away from apartheid in South Africa. But treating this odious practice in such a benign manner is like treating terminal cancer with laetrile. It just doesn't work.

The South African Government operates under an entrenched system of institutional racism, in open defiance of any standard of civilized society. Yet the Reagan administration still prefers to adhere to its misguided policy and to reward this inhuman

South African Government by making it the United States' largest trading partner and by becoming the second-largest foreign investor in South Africa.

Through apartheid, the South African Government allows a minority of 4.5 million whites to deny 22 million black South Africans their basic human rights. Black South Africans cannot vote. They cannot run for political office to have a voice in their own destiny. The South African Government's homelands policy has resulted in over 9 million black South Africans being stripped of their citizenship in the land of their own birth. The South African Government has increased its oppression of trade unions. Its policies have resulted in the death of blacks fighting for their rights and for their ever-elusive freedom. A virtual police state exists in South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, we must raise our voices loudly and clearly in opposition to the unconscionable practice of apartheid and to the Reagan administration's policy. Constructive engagement is not the answer. Tolerance of apartheid is not the answer. We must remember the oppressed black South Africans longing for their freedom and for the respect they deserve. We must speak for them and to agitate on their behalf. Our national values and interests mandate that we take up the cause of those longing to be free of the shackles of their oppressors. It is our moral responsibility.

We can help break the back of apartheid by breaking the grip of those who foster that obnoxious practice. We must remember the human beings for whom and with whom we fight. We must keep them and their indomitable spirit in our hearts and minds. We can have an effect by opposing administration policy and by passing strong antiapartheid legislation, which I endorse wholeheartedly. We can do that by expressing our views and by pressing unceasingly against the relentless wall of apartheid.

South African bishop Desmond Tutu, recipient of the 1984 Nobel Prize for Peace, has said that no amount of repression can contain the millions of black South Africans who are determined to be free. Let us join them in their determination and their efforts. We must stand with them, hands joined, in unity of spirit, for a cause that is right. One day they will be free, and I, for one, want to help hasten that day.●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in supporting H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985.

South Africa is the only country in the world that practices legally mandated racism. The United States



cannot associate itself with a government that oppresses 23 million of its citizens. As the champion of democracy, freedom, and human rights in the world, we must demonstrate our abhorrence and repugnance for apartheid.

The effects of apartheid are devastating. In the past 35 years, 3 million black, 800,000 mix race, and 400 Indian South African citizens have been forcibly removed from their land. As a result of poor sanitary conditions, low standards of nutrition, and the lack of sufficient hospitals and doctors in the so-called homelands, infant mortality among blacks is as high as 200 per 1,000 live births (among whites, it is 15 per 1,000 live births). The poor living conditions also give blacks a life expectancy of 57 years as compared with 70 years for whites.

Some of South Africa's principal exports include diamonds, uranium, metals, metallic ores, and gold. Yet, a black mineworker earns an average of \$136 a month, while his white counterpart earns an average of \$750 a month. The South African Government spends \$7 on each white student's education for every \$1 spent on a black student's education. Since August 1984, over 270 blacks have been killed, and over 4,500 blacks have been arrested.

South Africa's black majority is denied the right to citizenship, the right to national political participation, the right to choose where one will live and work, and the right of free assembly to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

It is quite obvious that the Reagan administration's policy of constructive engagement is not working. The South African Government recently established a new constitution that does not even acknowledge the very existence of black South Africans.

We must make it clear to the South African Government and to the rest of the world that we find apartheid totally unacceptable. We must do more than say we don't like apartheid.

My colleague, Mr. GRAY, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a bill that will impose economic sanctions against the South African Government. H.R. 1460 prohibits loans to the South African Government, prohibits all new investment in South Africa and Namibia, bans the importation of krugerrands into the United States, and prohibits computer sales to the South African Government. These sanctions demonstrate our abhorrence and repugnance for such oppression.

I have joined as a cosponsor of H.R. 1460, and I hope that this body will take favorable action on this important measure without delay. It is time for the United States to take a strong and clear stand against apartheid. ●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to join with my colleagues

in bringing attention to the administration's continued support of the racist and brutal policies of the Government of South Africa. In face of the administration's tacit approval of the apartheid policies in South Africa, I believe citizens all across our Nation must make known to their lawmakers that it is unacceptable to continue to have close relations with a country where human rights are denied to 73 percent of the population because of their race. In their own country, South African blacks must carry passes at all times; they cannot vote; they cannot own property in the "white areas" which comprise 87 percent of the country; they are barred from making any economic progress; and many have to live apart from their families.

U.S. citizens must object loudly against our Nation's economic power reinforcing a government that frequently displays brutal violence towards its citizens—shooting and killing innocent people who feel compelled to demonstrate against the injustices of the white-supremacist government of South Africa.

The Reagan administration speaks of the importance of constructive engagement, and is an enthusiastic applauder of South African President Botha's tepid and cosmetic reforms. Our citizens must ask out loud, "What have 4 years of this so-called constructive engagement brought?"

If at the highest level of our Government there is silence and inaction, then our national objection to the policy of apartheid and the Government of South Africa must begin at the grass roots level, for our national patience is fast running out.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the city council of my hometown of San Jose, CA, on April 2, 1985, voted to begin banning investment of city money in South African Government, in corporate securities, and in American firms that have subsidiaries in South Africa. I commend the council for their action for I believe they voted their conscience in passing this measure. I hope my colleagues in the House will follow their example when legislation comes to the floor which seeks to make it the policy of the United States to condemn and seek eradication of the policy of apartheid through specific prohibitions and restrictions on loans, investments and exports to South Africa. ●

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my colleagues BARNEY FRANK and MICKEY LELAND for bringing this very important special order to the floor of the House. It is timely and necessary.

Racism in any form is a repugnant thing. In this century it has taken on many disguises, and has often been perpetuated by the mechanisms of 20th century ideological praxis. Mil-

lions of lives have been lost or ruined because of the excesses of Stalinism, Nazism, religious hatred, and ethnic programs. This is a unique characteristic of modern man, unmatched since the religious wars of the Middle Ages.

Apartheid is the latest manifestation of State-sponsored racism. Nonwhites do not share the fruits of the rich natural wealth of South Africa, and have been denied basic political freedom. Dozens of protesters have been shot by the security forces, and no end is in sight.

Apartheid will not end of its own volition. Pretoria must be convinced that the world community will end all economic and political ties unless apartheid is ended. Only in this way will change come to South Africa.

Ronald Reagan has not only refused to condemn apartheid, but has given it aid and comfort. Constructive engagement is nothing more than appeasement, and has gotten us nowhere. It is quite clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the United States will be tainted by this appeasement unless we change our course.

I have reason to hope for a change in American policy. We are witnessing a grassroots movement against constructive engagement. Most recently, students at Columbia University in my congressional district have bravely protested Columbia's investments in companies doing business in South Africa. In this spirit of hope, I would like to submit the following article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 1985]

PROTESTS AT COLUMBIA: STUDENTS AND THE ISSUES HAVE CHANGED SINCE THE 60'S

(By Michael Oreskes)

Columbia students are sitting-in on the steps of Hamilton Hall again, just as they did in something called "the 60's"—a phrase that conjures both a time and a state of mind.

To some, these new protests at Columbia University are like the buds of spring on the quadrangle, the first signs of a new student activism after a long winter.

But these are very different times, others say. The issues are different, the attitudes are different—the only thing that is really the same is the building.

Yet that earlier time is a presence, nonetheless, that in tangible ways is influencing what happens today.

To the students, the Columbia protests of the spring of 1968 are a received memory, something they learn about almost the way they learn of such events as the assassination of President John F. Kennedy or the war in a land called Vietnam. It is a legacy they may not have fully understood at first and would now just as soon separate themselves from.

To the university administration, the protests—in which the police were called to clear out students who had occupied Hamilton Hall and four other buildings—are a specter and a lesson, a symbol of how badly things can go wrong when mishandled.

In 1968, the protests focused at first on defense-related research, then broadened to issues including support for the Harlem

community's objections to a gymnasium Columbia was planning for Morningside Park.

In 1985, the students have taken the steps of Hamilton Hall to demand that Columbia University, which has an endowment of just under a billion dollars, withdraw \$32.5 million invested in companies doing business with South Africa because of its policy of apartheid.

The university has already restricted its investments, but it is reluctant to simply write off many of America's biggest corporations.

The protest comes as opponents of the South African government almost daily offer themselves up for arrest at the South African consulates in New York and Washington, on a charge of what could be called trespassing with intent to end apartheid.

The Columbia students, conducting the first real sit-in anyone can remember on the campus since the end of the Vietnam War, say they are prepared to be arrested, too, in the same peaceful fashion. They have even tried to negotiate with the university on terms for the arrests.

But they have underestimated the impact of history. Calling the police on campus is, in the words of one senior administrator, "anathema" to much of the Columbia faculty and administration who remember the fire last time.

The administrators who run Columbia cannot help but have in mind the events of the spring of 1968 when thousands of students participated in what was variously described as an uprising, a protest, a rebellion or a riot.

The students seized five buildings, and after a week of indecision, mediation and debate, the college president, Dr. Grayson Kirk, asked the police onto the campus in the dead of night to clear the buildings.

The result was awful, everyone now agrees. The students resisted. The police officers used fists and nightsticks. Many students were injured, and hundreds were arrested.

There was a law professor on campus that spring named Michael I. Sovern. After the clash between the police and students, Professor Sovern was named to head a 10-member faculty committee that, to state it simply, was given the job of putting Columbia back together.

Today, Professor Sovern is Columbia's president. He is the one who must decide what to do about the students on the steps of Hamilton Hall.

Knowing history is not the same as learning the lessons of history, or even knowing which lessons to learn. Dr. Sovern points this out to acquaintances by reminding them that a cat that sits on a hot stove will never sit on a hot stove again, but neither will it sit on a cold stove.

Dr. Kirk was criticized for calling the police. But he was also criticized for not calling them sooner, thus allowing the situation to build to a crisis.

Dr. Sovern and his aides are watching Hamilton Hall closely. But there is little sign of crisis on the campus. Most students are going about business as usual.

That is one difference. Perhaps even more important, the students on the steps of Hamilton Hall, almost all of them undergraduates, are very different from the earlier protesters.

If there is one word that everyone uses to describe the students on the steps of Hamilton Hall, today it is "disciplined." Their protest has been neatly organized to draw maximum attention with minimum disruption.

They have even computerized all of their statements and the statements of the administration "so we can respond quickly," said Wally Hays, who oversees the desktop computer used by the protesters.

These students are not fighting the generational war of their predecessors. "These students are often very close to their parents," said Dennis Dalton, a Barnard political-science professor who has been advising several students. He said many of the students felt considerable pressure from parents to end the protest.

The college and the world of adults is not their enemy. "We don't hate President Sovern," said David Goldiner, a 20-year-old protest leader who remembers being wheeled to anti-Vietnam war protests in a stroller. "We think we have a better argument than he does."

Dr. Sovern met this week with five of the protesters, who had been conducting a fast. Anyone steeped in the campus culture of the 60's might have expected tension and invective. Instead, they had two hours of high-level discussion, said Eric Foner, a history professor who accompanied them.

Professor Foner and others say that far from being an exception to the career-minded students who have become prevalent on campus, the protesters are quite concerned about the danger the protest holds to their academic careers and their chances for getting into good professional schools.

The students have clearly succeeded in getting attention for their cause, and there are beginning to be demonstrations on other campuses.

What they have not been able to do, at least yet, is rally the student body behind them. In 1968, a few hundred students occupied buildings, but hundreds more, maybe thousands, milled and marched outside in support.

"In 1968 you had a spark thrown in a tinderbox," said Diane Ravitch, an historian of American education. Protesters, she suggested, were able to tap a deep well of discontent then. "Here," she said, "There's the spark but there is no tinderbox." ●

#### MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I continue on my advice to the privileged orders, which, as I have said, include first and foremost my colleagues. We happen to find ourselves at a critical moment in our hierarchical, societal position in one of the pinnacle points of privilege. But mostly to those real wielders of power, the real privileged orders, which today in America represent those forces that ensconced in an unaccountable way to the people in basic violation of the basic tenets that gave rise to our form of government under the Constitution that is operative today, are wielding the power of war and peace; the American standard of living; the doom or the extinction of millions of our small business enterprises.

To these privileged orders I address, and continue to address my remarks. I

had intended to begin by continuing what I left somewhat unfinished yesterday with respect to this peculiar situation that brings us full circle in America back to the 200-year-ago point and just almost on the eve of our bicentennial celebration of the Government that we enjoy today. So many Americans think that we had a bicentennial in 1976; the truth is that our form of government will not have a 200th birthday until 1989.

There is nothing, I might point out to my colleagues, that vouchsafes the continuity or the permanence of this form of government. We take it for granted, true. But we better start working at it.

I was starting to begin on that premise when I joined, just a few minutes ago, in some of the discussion that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who, with his unmatched wit and incisive intellect has so eloquently pointed out and has, I think, removed some of the obscurantism of the current President and his regime in the trappings that they have tried to provide in guise of a policy, but which in effect is no policy at all. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts for at least pointing out the incoherency, if not the actual hypocrisy and outright insincerity, in what is being uttered and what is being done.

I wanted to take this point to pick up on that matter having to do with our relations and our present catastrophic course in Central America, specifically. But generally toward those countries that share the destiny south of the border with us, beginning with the Republic of Mexico.

In the first place, we cannot continue to indulge in the misperceptions that still prevail in the minds of the overwhelmingly and preponderant number of Americans in and out of the Congress, in and out of the White House. Also, the reference to the situation or the anomalous position and conflicting position of the administration and its spokesmen with respect to the situation in Central America with specific reference to the Republic of Nicaragua, and the South African country or government or republic.

It reminded me very much, I wanted my colleague from Texas and my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts to hear this because in 1957, as a freshman member of the State Senate of Texas, at a time before the name Martin Luther King was heard, I got up and filibustered, I used the instrumentality that had really been born in the Texas State Senate; not in the U.S. Senate. The unlimited rule of debate and the filibuster, as it got to be called popularly, really had its birth in that great institution known as the Texas State Senate.



We were facing that particular year the massive group of resistance bills that had emanated out of the State of Virginia and had wended its course through the 11 Confederate States. I might say that the record will show that it was only in the Texas Legislature where they were even debated. In the Arkansas Legislature, for example, the 16 basic measures were approved in about 16 minutes. So that when I got up, took the floor, held it continuously without cease and without sitting for a total of some 26½ hours, and then combined with a senior member at that time, but a recent former colleague of ours in the Congress, Mr. Abraham Kazen, we filibustered and tied up the Senate a total of 36 hours, and we ended up in enabling the Senate to approve only 2 of the 16.

But the arguments that were advanced were identical to what you heard here today. Now, I cannot evoke that atmosphere: The sounds, the smells, the hatred, the putredness of outworn prejudices encrusted into the law. I had first seen that on the city council level of San Antonio, where we had the same thing. Astoundedly, I was the one that had a hand in the first so-called Supreme Court decision that was the beginning of the so-called civil rights, and that was the unconstitutionality of restrictive covenants in the alienation of property based on race, color, creed, or nationality.

At that time it was very popular a practice in San Antonio and in Texas generally, but particularly in that part, and more virulently in east Texas, to have in the master deed records with the county clerk, filed these restrictive covenants that read:

"If at any time this property, either through disease or alienation or sale or inheritance or bequeath, should become an ownership in the hands of a Negro or a Mexican," and in some sporadic instances they also included the word Jew, "then the original title, that is the title to this land, shall revert to the original grantor." That is the one who had originally filed the master deeds when he or she proceeded to develop plats of land or what we call today developments or subdivisions.

□ 1700

So that here we were in the glorious year of our Lord 1947, while in the law school I had studied that very diligently and then after the war, and subsequent to 1946, I read with great interest in a law journal that the black group in St. Louis, MO, had raised the magnificent sum of \$250,000 in order to prosecute the case of restrictive covenants through the judiciary and were headed for the Supreme Court.

Now, in San Antonio, we had had, some of us, the same experiences that were customary and were encrusted into the State statutes known as Jim

Crow laws, and the other State constitutional provisions that called for strict segregation up and down the line. We were no different from South Africa. The antimiscegenation laws were criminal culpability in nature, and in the city of San Antonio, lo and behold, I organized what was known as the first, sponsored Mexican-American—even though I hate hyphenated names, I will use this for descriptive purposes—businessmen. These were relatively young men who had somehow or other remained in San Antonio during the war and they were able to profit, and some of them reached the great position of being either millionaires or near-millionaires. So after the war I thought it was time that the people of Mexican origin do more than just sit back and whine and complain about discrimination.

As I say and repeat, in some areas, including San Antonio at that time, and particularly before the war, we faced, and especially those who had a darker texture of their skins, and in my family, as I said once before here, I am the lightest complexioned in the family, so that I shared some experiences that were directed to my brothers and my sister that unfortunately I would be spared because the individual prohibiting entry say to the skating rink on St. Mary Street, or to the swimming pool at San Pedro Park, or further over in New Braunfels, TX, to the Land Apart, and before that, well, later it became a State park so we were able to proscribe that kind of practice, but at that time I had the experience of having these individuals say, "All right, we do not allow Mexicans." Then they would look at me and say, "Well, you are all right because you are Spanish."

This is the reason I do not like this word Hispanic today, even though it offends some of my colleagues of Puerto Rican and Cuban descent who are generally classified as Hispanics. I do not like it because the people who did not want to be associated with that distasteful appellation, even though they emerged from the same group, would say they were not Mexican; they were Spanish, Hispanic. So I have this inbred dislike for that word, even though it is a very noble word. In Spanish it is a word that is very beautiful, *Hispanidad*. It is a beautiful word, but nevertheless, in order to come up to today, because what I heard here from some of the Congressmen is reminiscent, and some of the things that have been put out by the PR people of the South African Government are identical to what we were told during the filibuster by pre-eminent associates in the State senate and by the State senate leaders then and the State leaders generally in Texas.

But in San Antonio, my baptism of fire began my first year on the city

council, because before I ran for the city council, before I even thought I would be in politics, I had organized a Pan American Progressive Association. I was trying to get some social conscience responsibility and some social conscience out of some of these newly rich businessmen, and they did. They came across mostly because they knew my family, knew my father, and they thought that anybody the son of Don Unitas was going to be all right.

The first thing they found was that I got involved in some of the then crises. For instance, I had a returning veteran of World War II by the last name of Trevino who came to me and said, "I wanted to buy a home with my savings and my mustering-out pay. Over here in this new development that is just under construction, near Woodlawn Park, and the developer there and the people who are going to sell the homes said they could not sell to me because I am Mexican."

Well, at first it seemed very difficult to accept that, but it was true. Then I found that their reason was they could not give him a clear title because of these master deed records and these instruments that were so basic and would not allow a title guaranty company to give what they call an unclouded title.

So then I was pondering that situation when here comes a very humble little gentleman, one of those salt-of-the-earth who are commonly called Mexicans, but who was, like the overwhelming, preponderant majority, just asking for tranquility, to work hard, earn a living, provide for the family, find a roof, provide food and clothing. All of the sons of this man, whose name was Abdon Puente, had been in the service. One of them had come back and had befriended a buddy. They had fought together. They had been on the same team beginning back when the 36th Texas Division was mustered in, and they were in Italy at Anzio, and when they came out, this buddy of his was not Mexican-American, his last name was Humphrey, and he happened to have a little family house. He was totally a 100-percent disabled veteran. He had great need for \$3,000 in cash. The little home he had was in what they call the Palo Alto addition in San Antonio. It was originally known as the Mayfield subdivision. This was named after an individual who was very famous after World War I in our stretch of the woods, and his name was Earl B. Mayfield, who ran in 1920 as a candidate of the Ku Klux Klan Party and won. So one of those who was close to him was a businessman who also bore an illustrious name. He was the one who had the title vested in him by virtue of the master deed records. So when Humphrey said in good faith, "I will sell to you, young Puente," and the Puente

family dreamed of having a little home, because all they had had was a lean-to shack, so upon this young veteran's return and his buddy saying, "I will sell," they gave him the \$3,000 in cash, which Mr. Humphrey immediately spent.

Lo and behold here comes Mr. Puente, the father, with his hat in his hand, and said, "Mr. Gonzalez, I have been told that maybe you could help us," and then he laid out a notice, a filed notice, that had been served on him by the deputy sheriff in which he was asked to appear before the district court. At that time it was known as the 37th district court, in Bexar County, and to show cause why an injunction should not be honored.

□ 1710

The injunction was filed by the gentleman who had inherited the master deed titles to all of those developments and homes in the Earl B. Mayfield Park Subdivision, and what he was saying was: "Look, you not only are going to lose your money, you have to turn that house over to me because you, Mr. Puente, are a Mexican, and this is a restriction."

I then checked with Mr. Humphrey, who said, yes, that the title company had informed him that there was a cloud, but he did not understand what that was nor did they explain the nature of the cloud.

So the next thing I did, I said, "Mr. Puente, you have to have an attorney to file an answer. Otherwise you lose by default."

He said, "I have no money."

I picked up the phone and called a friend, a very benevolent lawyer, a Mexican-American lawyer, one of the very few at that time in San Antonio, and he said, "Henry, I can't practice really adequately and competently in district court, I just reserve my practice to the lower courts, municipal court"—what they used to call the corporation court—"and maybe a county court of law case now and then, frankly."

"Well," I said, "I don't know who I can get that will do it free."

He said, "Well, I tell you what, maybe I can recommend somebody." And we talked to somebody and they said, "No, we can't do it for free."

So I, being a law school graduate, told the lawyer, "Look, I'll prepare the answer if you will use your name as the attorney of record," which he did. I said, "Just to hold up the case, because it is coincidental, but I know this case in point is ultimately going to land in the Supreme Court if it hasn't already. All we want to do is ask for a postponement, and the immediate request is to pass the hearing on the preliminary injunction over for 30 days."

That was done, but when the 30 days was up, we had the same dilemma of finding a lawyer. To his eternal credit,

one of the most illustrious legal minds I have known and had the privilege of knowing, now Judge Carlos Cadena, who is one of the judges on the fourth court of appeals and is celebrating his 20th anniversary on that court this week—and I wish to take this opportunity to salute him—he was then not too long out of law school, like I, and he was trying to make ends meet, but he said, "I'll do everything possible to help. The only thing is you're going to have to find some way of paying for the filing fees and some of the incidental court costs."

I said, "Don't worry about it, Carlos."

Judge Cadena is a constitutional expert. In the University of Texas Law School he was an honor student, and everybody ranked him as one of those brilliant legal minds that developed his talent along constitutional law lines.

Well, the rest is history because we delayed it. But in the meanwhile the newspapers found out about it, and the Board of the Pan-American Progressive Association called me in and said, "We understand you're involving us in this."

And I said, "No, not yet, because we haven't gotten the bill for the court costs, but it is my hope to do so soon."

They said, "No, because the newspapers mentioned that what this does, it is going to put us in there with the nigger."

And remember, that when I filibustered the race bills in the State senate in 1957, the words used on the senate floor were not Negro, they were not black, they were plain old Texas nigger, except that the newspapers were very kind to those senators and they cleaned up the language and substituted the word, "Negro." But when I faced that, I heard one of the senators say, "Will you yield?" And I said, "Yes, for a question."

And he said:

"You don't know the niggers like I do. In my district we have more niggers than we have whites, and they don't want to intermarry, and that is what you want."

I was reminded of that because of the recent PR poop put out by the South Africans saying that we are thinking of making it noncriminal to violate the miscegenation statutes, and I remember the senator saying that.

Then I said, "Senator, I will reply to you. Those who have cynical ideas as to why I am arising, we live in a cynical world. If you do anything, you are supposed to have an angle, either political or some kind of self-aggrandizing angle."

I said, "In my case let me tell you this; I know that I am a novice, I know that I am an amateur politician, but I have enough brains to know the logistics of the situation in my district."

At that time the State senatorial district consisted of the entire county,

just like in my first 8 years in this House my district was the entire county. I had the second-largest district in the Nation.

Anyway, there I was answering the senator, and I said, "Senator, in my county the citizens, the Americans, the fellow San Antonians of black descent, don't constitute, and never have, even 8 percent of the total population, so there certainly couldn't be any political mileage in that."

As a matter of fact, when I got up and fought the bill, the resolutions, or the ordinances in the city council in 1954, I was considered a kamikaze, a suicide, a political suicide, and this is what I was told in the State senate.

I said, "Senator, look these San Antonians may be less than 8 percent, but I have had a great chance to get around my district and meet them, and the thing that strikes me is that per capita I would say they are the most religious of any in my county, but in all of my goings and comings the clear thing I have seen, just as clearly and perceptively and limpidly and as purely as anything could be, was their desire to be brothers, not brothers-in-law."

So I can see the psychology behind the South African Government in saying, "Well, you know, we'll loosen up and maybe we'll allow some miscegenation," because I can just see the impact it will have on a lot of those Southern minds that always feared, first, that it has to be come Communist plot if we were trying to fight those segregatory bills, or, plot if we were trying to fight those segregatory bills, or second, if they could not prove that—and there was no way they could; in fact, I have never been to Russia, I have never belonged to any organization any more questionable than the Lions Club or the Optimists Club or the Holy Name Society of the Cathedral parish into which I was born, and so they could not make a case out of that—there had to be some other reason.

So the reason was that he is getting some political mileage. But then, as I answered the senator, that would have been foolhardy.

It is the same thing today. It is no different. Those who struggled in the civil rights days in the fifties and sixties, but especially in the sixties, so often said that freedom is not free, and the truth is that freedom is never won permanently. Every generation has to fight the fight in its own way under the peculiar environment of that particular generation.

This is what the fight is today, I say to my colleagues. Our involvement south of the border fails to distinguish between the Old World as it was and the New, and it is not even the same world today as it was, say, in 1960. As I have said, as great an admirer and sup-



porter as I was of President John F. Kennedy, if he were the President today and he were to try to sell the Alliance for Progress, it would not take in today's Latin America. We will use that lump word. And the reason is that the Alliance for Progress was really unilateral. Though the spirit behind it was collective, it was permissu on what was said at Punta del Este when the Alliance for Progress was unveiled, and that is that we are coequals. No matter how large we are and no matter how small, the smallest country here, we said that we are going to work with you on a parity. But since then what we have now—and I think it is due to these misperceptions, lack of knowledge, and abysmal ignorance, is that we do not see ourselves other than as we have learned our history in this part of North America.

□ 1720

When we say we are Americans, we not only antagonize the people that share the new world to the south of us, but also north of us. I recently had a letter from a Canadian who had reacted to one of these presentations and said, "As a North American—" and I resent very much America's exclusiveness in trying to segregate itself as the only Americans around, so he considers himself a North American; but south of the border this is the way we are described, those "North Americans."

Now, the history there in our relations has been as late as 1929 Calvin Coolidge's invasion of Nicaragua and our keeping troops there for almost 10 years until we had trained the National Guard and installed the Somoza regime, the most dictatorial, the most tyrannical, the most corrupt of any land at any time. We are the ones that imposed it and kept it up. It was not Russia. It was not England. It was not France. It was not any other country but the United States of America.

We did not hear anyone talk about freedom of the press, freedom from such things as torture and political extermination. I did not hear any leader; in fact, I heard great leaders like Franklin Roosevelt take a very cynical, a very uncharacteristic pose when they described Somoza in these words, and this was FDR. It was not Ronald Reagan, but I am almost sure the President's mind set in such that he would appreciate what FDR said, referring to Nicaragua, referring to Somoza during World War II. He said, "Yes, I know he is an S.O.B., but he is our S.O.B."

This is a cynicism that we can ill afford to continue to harbor any more than we can continue to harbor the misperceptions that I see obviously reflected during the debates.

The reason is simple. The reason is that unless we discern what is happen-

ing, now, if we are upset by what is happening and has happened thus far in the smallest country in El Salvador where after \$2 billion of direct aid in less than 4 years we are back to square one and if we are where we are in the case of Nicaragua where we have literally impelled them, where the President's position as enunciated just 2 weeks ago was, "Look, drop dead or I will kill you." This is the way the world is interpreting America's position.

I think it is time we divest ourselves of these misperceptions, because they will be and continue to be highly costly, not only in Treasury, but in blood. Not only that, but because it will be that we will forever make of the new world a replica of the old world with its ancient hatreds and animosities and inbred dislikes and horrible, horrible examples of wars, external wars, vast wars, killing wars, destructive wars, because that country to the south of us is entirely different. The world has shrunk. They know there is hope.

These teeming masses that now in the aggregate outnumber the total population of the United States, and this has been true only in the last decade and a half, are no longer going to take the oppression, the tyranny, the hunger.

Just think, in Honduras where we are occupying now and we had and I want to point out to my colleague from Texas that was here a while ago [Mr. LELAND], if he happens to be up in his room watching this on the closed circuit TV, that I was the only one who protested the Governor of Texas, Mark White, sending in the Texas National Guard. Even the Governor of California had more sense and refused to do it, even though he is a Republican; but our Governor in Texas not only sent the Texas National Guard, the are still down there on this Operation Pine Tree, which will probably terminate around May 3 and a lot is going to happen between now and then; but in selecting the component guard elements, the commander said they were going to go to the Southwest and to the Valley of Texas where the density of the word they use this day "Hispanics," which as I have said before, I dislike, because if anybody is going to call me anything, then they ought to say Mexican. I have never liked hyphenated Americanism and I have long thought when it was not politically popular to do so to say, "Look, we are either Americans or we are not, and if we are not, then I want to know what I am." That has been my position since I can remember and it offended some people. The professional ethnics, who all they know how to do and earn a living doing it is beating the ethnic drums, the racial tom-toms, and I have never believed that. I have believed in fighting for

the guarantees that American constitutional freedom gives us, without respect to race, color, or creed.

I would have taken the same position on the city council or in the State senate at that time. Remember, this was before Martin Luther King was even a name that anybody heard and where we had very, very entrenched ferocious feelings.

I had to face a pistolero, that is a gunman that the East Texas White Citizens Council sent over. It was so foolish, because he walked over to the capital and somehow or another confronted me and I just told him to his face, I said, "Mister, I think you ought to know, I come from the west side of San Antonio. I know you have got that gun there under your coat, but you take one step to me or you make one menacing move and I am going to strip you of that gun and kill you with it." That was the only way I knew, coming up the rough way, to handle the situation.

The captain of the Austin police force called and wanted to know if I would want protective custody and I said no. In the first place, I commuted. I did not have money to live in Austin during the sessions, so I used to drive. I would eat breakfast at home, get in my car and drive to the State senate meeting. I would be back and eat supper with my family and sleep at home. It did a lot of things, including making me invulnerable to the lobbyists who would usually try to get you at supertime at the old Driscoll Hotel in Austin; so nobody knew what I would do until the senate session opened and I came in my car and went in.

So these things that I see today really are kind of amateurish compared to what we faced in Texas. It was strange to see that just as in the case of the board of directors of the Pan American Progressive Association, who said, "How dare you get us involved with the nigger? You can't put us on the same plane."

Well, the reason was that the Mexican-American if his skin was dark enough, if he looked Indian, he would get discriminated on a par, especially in the rural areas with the blacks. They lived no differently. They were treated the same.

If you were blue eyed, light complexioned like many Mexican-Americans are and you became acceptable, well, it was human nature. The leading lawyers of the day, with two exceptions, Mexican-American lawyers who had been accepted, one of them to the Rotary Club, a couple to the downtown Lions Club, well, they felt they were acceptable. If they wanted to continue to be acceptable, they would have to acquire all the trappings of prejudices that the dominant group reflected.

Well, lo and behold, today the majority in San Antonio—they were not then—at that time I would say it was around 42½ percent, today the majority of the citizens, a little better than 51 or 52 percent, are Mexican-Americans in the city.

□ 1730

But that does not guarantee enlightenment and progressive government, because the equal false notion that if you are a minority member you are downtrodden, and that you are virtuous, and that you are going to be liberal is, of course, a fallacy. What it does reflect is the ignorance of the people who use that kind of an approach of the people. They just do not know people. Just like our leaders clearly revealed to me their misperceptions of what they call Latin America. This is what the President revealed, it will be 3 years in October, when he went down to four of the South American countries and made the first blooper in one country by saying he was in another.

Well, you know, everybody can understand that, but I think the most significant thing was when he came back and landed in California and his first explanation was "Gee, I didn't know they were that different."

Well, we had better start knowing it. We had better start realizing history from the perspective of development.

Our Thirteen Colonies when we read American history as if those were the Thirteen Colonies, actually we were a part of 37. The others now form part of that which we call Canada and Nova Scotia and the like. But to the south of us, by the time Plymouth Rock became a historical note in our books, in Mexico City you had had a university and a printing press for more than 150 years. So that unless we understand the intricacies of the historical developments, cultural, class systems, we will continue to make serious errors, as we are indeed in other parts of the world.

I do not think we would have made the error of having lost 50,000 of our American young, and untold billions of treasury in Southeast Asia if our leaders, both in and out of the Congress, in the Oval Office, the Presidency, had had a correct perception of the real world, of this we call communism.

We also should learn that we have to develop some kind of realization that there is a vast difference between an indigenous, that is a native civil war, and one that brings into play through external forces some ruling power, because our continuing our neglect in that respect is fatal.

At this point I would introduce for the RECORD, for instance, in view of the dialog preceding me, a statement and an analysis prepared by the Reverend Father William R. Callahan, who is here and heads what is known

as the Quixote Center in Hyattsville, MD. He is one of the most knowledgeable and experienced men with respect to Nicaragua specifically that I know of in the United States. He not only has served in missionary capacities, he has done more than that; he has lived, he has lived amongst, he has ministered to, and he is intimately acquainted with the Nicaraguan people.

At this time I offer this prepared summary, plus two articles that he also gave to me appearing under the sponsorship of the Quixote Center. One of them is by Anthony Quinton the former U.S. Ambassador to Nicaragua. It was extracted from a magazine known as *Sojourners*, or March 1983. And another "Religion in Nicaragua," the Catholic Institute for International Relations of England, and published under the auspices of the Quixote Center.

The materials referred to follow:

#### CHURCH AND STATE IN NICARAGUA

**Background**—The Reagan Administration's suggestion that negotiations in Nicaragua take place under the mediation of the Nicaraguan bishops is a seemingly attractive option that needs reflection.

Nicaragua is a religious country, 85% of the people profess Roman Catholicism. Nicaraguans have a long history of docility to their bishops.

The bishops eventually lined up against Somoza, gave permission for priests and religious to serve in the new government, acknowledged the right of the Sandinistas to lead the new government (cf Nov. 1979 pastoral letter) then turned against the Sandinistas, withdrew the permission for the priests, and in the last three years have fought the government charging it with being Marxist. The bishops have protested censorship, denounced the draft, (on ideological grounds, not religious, as serving the Sandinistas party) and quarreled repeatedly with the government.

On the other hand, the Sandinistas have made constant efforts to dialogue with the bishops, most recently after the 1984 elections when the bishops acknowledged that the Sandinista party had won strong support.

In weighing the Reagan proposal for episcopal mediation, several points need reflection.

1. *The Roman Catholic bishops, as a whole, have taken a strong adversarial position toward the Sandinista party and toward the newly elected Nicaraguan government. They are not perceived as impartial either inside Nicaragua or internationally.*

The bishops, while condemning the Sandinistas for "ideological aggression," have consistently refused to condemn the contra violence. Archbishop Obando y Bravo and Bishop Vega, the two bishops to head the Bishops Conference in the last three years, have been especially hostile to the Nicaraguan government and the Sandinista party.

In this they differ sharply from the perception of neutrality reflected by Archbishop Rivera y Damas of El Salvador who is acting as a mediator in that country.

Thus the bishops appear to lack the appearance of neutrality which is necessary to act as a mediator.

2. *The struggle between the bishops and the Nicaraguan government is essentially*

*political, not religious, i.e. a struggle over "turf", not over religious freedom.*

Even most opponents agree that the church is far freer to worship, speak out and oppose the government than during the time of Somoza.

The intense involvement and backing of government programs not only by many priests and religious, but also by large numbers of Catholics in local communities is a key dimension of support and legitimacy for the Nicaraguan government.

The bishops appear to fear the Nicaraguan government and its populist programs as a threat to the institutional loyalty of Catholics to their bishops.

3. *Many religious opponents of the Nicaraguan government suggest that Nicaragua will become "another Cuba".*

The fact is that after almost 6 years, Nicaragua, economically, socially, politically and religiously looks nothing like Cuba after that same interval. After 6 years Cuban churches had been closed or practice confined to church buildings. Many religious leaders had been driven out. Religious schools had been closed. The Catholic church had fought Castro, lost, and been sharply reduced in scope and influence.

Exactly the opposite is true after six years in Nicaragua. Churches of all denominations enjoy freedom of worship. The churches are vigorous, as witnessed in the public activity of those supporting the revolution and those opposing it. Religious schools are flourishing, and the intra-church debates are vigorous.

4. *The struggle in Nicaragua is not only between the government and the bishops but within the church community, i.e., between Catholics who oppose the revolution and those powerful segments of the Catholic community that support the revolution.*

In July, 1984, the Sandinistas expelled 10 foreign priests, apparently as a rebuff to Archbishops Obando y Bravo who had led a public demonstration in support of Fr. Pena whom the government had charged to be a "contra" agent. Yet the bishops have withdrawn priestly faculties and forced out of communities or out the country at least 30 priests and pastoral workers because they supported the revolution.

5. *The religious struggle in Nicaragua is a microcosm of the larger struggle throughout Latin America and the Roman Catholic Church over liberation theology and its call to align the church with the poor.*

Traditional Latin American church alliances have been with the middle/upper class landed and business people and the military, a "three-legged stool of stability" for those societies. Liberation theology, rising from reflection on the lived experience of the poor, has been given powerful impetus by the bishops at Medellin (1968) and Puebla (1979). It encourages the church to make a preferential option for the poor and to work to change the structures of society which bestow the bulk of the wealth on a fraction of the people and keep the vast majority of the people in misery.

A powerful struggle is emerging throughout the Roman Catholic church over liberation theology. Opponents charge that it is Marxist and leads to a parallel "popular" church which is not in unity with the bishops. These charges are made in Nicaragua where government programs find strong support among those sectors of the church which have been most motivated by liberation theology.

Defenders insist that liberation theology is not separatist, that it flows from the



Bible, carries strong support from the teaching of the second Vatican Council, and has the support of Latin American bishops in council at Medellin and Puebla.

The Brazilian bishops have powerfully supported liberation theology and the Christian communities in which it has been grounded. The Nicaraguan bishops have been opposed.

The Vatican has entered the struggle against liberation theology with Cardinal Ratzinger serving as the "point man" for the Vatican.

6. *The Vatican's opposition to the Nicaraguan revolution likewise denies it the neutrality needed to act as an effective mediator.*

Judging from his words, Pope John Paul II has apparently put his trust in advisers who have labeled Nicaragua "Communist" and likened it to his experience of Eastern Europe.

In Managua the Pope used religious language of "unity with your bishops" which was understood to urge opposition to the government. Combined with his refusal to address the suffering experienced by the people of Nicaragua, his preaching stirred the crowd in its chant of "we want peace."

There is no credible evidence that the Sandinistas organized the crowd response, knowing full well that any disturbance would be detrimental to them in international opinion.

The Vatican pressure on the priests to leave the government is taken as a further sign of Vatican hostility to the revolution and the legitimacy which their presence confers on the revolution.

#### CONCLUSIONS

A. The adversarial posture of Nicaragua's Roman Catholic bishops toward the Sandinistas and their refusal to condemn contra violence denies the bishops the appearance of impartiality necessary to act as mediators in the conflict.

B. The Vatican's posture of hostility to the Nicaraguan government similarly precludes Vatican involvement in mediation.

C. Any Roman Catholic church mediation would have to be sought from bishops outside the country who are not already compromised on the Nicaraguan revolution.

D. U.S. policymakers should avoid being turned against the Nicaraguan revolution by people who manipulate religious symbols and events for political goals.

E. U.S. policymakers should be aware of the worldwide struggle over liberation theology and the political alliances of the various parties in the struggle.—Prepared by Rev. Wm. R. Callahan, S.J.—Quixote Center.

#### POLITICAL STRUGGLES IN RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE

"Religion in Nicaragua is everybody's concern," according to Rev. Cesar Jerez, SJ, former Jesuit provincial of Central America. "Everything pervades religion and religion pervades everything."

Because this is true, political debate in Nicaragua is often carried on in religious language. Struggles over the legitimacy and direction of the Sandinista revolution surface as struggles over liberation theology, the authority of bishops or the political role of the clergy.

#### PRIESTS IN GOVERNMENT POSITIONS

The saga of four Nicaraguan priests who hold prominent government posts is well known. They were originally given permission to serve in public office by the Nicaraguan bishops, but this was later modified to permit continued services only if they did

not perform priestly functions. It was finally withdrawn completely in an attempt to make them leave the government. Since the four have continued to serve, the Vatican has finally suspended them and has pressured the Jesuits (successfully) to expel Fernando Cardenal, the Minister of Education, from the Jesuit order. One of the four, Edgar Parrales, has asked for a formal dispensation from the priesthood but it has not yet been granted.

The hierarchy usually frames its concerns about this matter in the context of canon law which, in its newly revised form, forbids priests to occupy government posts. The priests speak of their gospel-based "preferential option for the poor" which they find well expressed in the Sandinista revolution.

But in a country as Catholic as Nicaragua, the presence of priests in high government posts serves another function: it gives legitimacy to the revolution among believing Catholics. Since it is well known that the Nicaraguan bishops and the \* \* \* making the church the third leg of a "three-legged stool" that propped up the social system of a continent. With the 1988 Bishops' Conference in Medellin, Colombia, the Latin American hierarchy announced a new solidarity, a "preferential option for the poor." That option is basic to liberation theology and it represents the direction of the Latin American Church for the last 20 years.

In Nicaragua, that "option for the poor" is likewise the basis for the Sandinista revolution. Thus, for the Nicaraguan bishops to inveigh against liberation theology is to condemn one of the very bases of the revolution itself. It calls into question the alliance of the church with the struggles of the poor.

Another element of the debate over liberation theology involves Marxism.

#### MARXISM

The Nicaraguan bishops have long labeled the Sandinistas "Marxists," an accusation designed to discredit the revolution in the eyes of the Nicaraguan people. Liberation theologians, on the other hand, maintain that Marxist philosophy provides useful tools for social and economic analysis, and that Marx's ideas can be used in applying the gospel to 20th century realities just as the secular philosophy of Aristotle \* \* \*.

#### CHRISTIAN BASE COMMUNITIES

Christian "base communities" grew in Nicaragua in the years before the Sandinista triumph. They are formed by small groups of believers who meet regularly to reflect on the Scriptures in the light of daily experience. Such reflection and prayer convinced many formerly passive people that the gospel called them to act for justice. It moved them away from a belief that "suffering now means happiness hereafter" and empowered them to work to change a social situation they once regarded as hopeless. For many Nicaraguan Christians, these communities were the beginning of their option for the "revolutionary process."

The Nicaraguan bishops and Pope John Paul II have condemned such groups, labeling them a "popular" or "parallel" church. Clergy supportive of the revolution who had been working with such communities have often been replaced with priests who are at least cool toward, if not downright opposed to, the revolution. Both the bishops and the Pope justify such moves by urging "public unity with the pastors of the church" or "docility to church teaching." They regard these groups as out of the control of the hierarchy.

Like other religious struggles in Nicaragua, this one has political overtones. The base communities are a strong base of support among the people for the revolution. By making them appear as "outside the fold," the hierarchy seeks to discredit the revolution, cause believing Christians to rethink their commitment to the revolution, and undermine an important base of legitimacy and popular support for the revolution.

#### OTHER STRUGGLES

Other "religious" struggles in Nicaragua likewise have strong political implications. They have included debates over Catholic education, the expulsion of foreign priests and the military draft. Moreover, there is, underneath it all, competition between church and government for a limited pool of talented leadership, especially among young people.

Young people themselves are deeply affected by the religious struggles. They have long been staunch supporters of the revolution. Cesar Jerez notes that the "hierarchy's distrust of the revolution is leading to a greater falling off of church participation among young people than among adults. . . ."

#### CONCLUSION

The most important implication of the religious struggle is the set of political alliances it has created. By opposing the revolution in terms similar to those voiced by Washington, Archbishop Obando y Bravo of Managua has linked the Nicaraguan hierarchy with U.S. interventionist policies. By refusing to condemn the *contras*' attacks on the civilian population while denouncing the Sandinista government, he has created the suspicion that he really favors the *contra* cause. By accusing the Nicaraguan government of "Marxism," he provides a new ammunition to U.S. policymakers and fuels the fears of Marxism that John Paul II brings from his Polish experience.

Thus, the "religious" struggles of Nicaragua have forged a political alliance between church hierarchy and the Reagan administration which seeks to discredit the alliance of many priests, religious and laity with the Sandinista revolution. It is an ideological struggle for the hearts and minds of Nicaraguans waged in religious language for political objectives.—Maureen Fiedler, William R. Callahan, and Dolores Pomerleau—Quixote Center.

#### RELIGION IN NICARAGUA

As a popular movement in an overwhelmingly Roman Catholic country, the Sandinista revolution was supported by hundreds of thousands of Catholics. It also had the specifically Christian support of many priests, religious and lay Catholics whose work in the shanty-towns and rural areas had given them first-hand experience of the injustice and suffering inflicted by the Somoza regime. One priest, Fr. Gaspar Garcia Laviana, died fighting with the Sandinistas, and a number of priests accepted ministerial and other senior positions in the new government. The bishops set the seal on this Catholic support when, in a pastoral letter in November 1979, four months after the Sandinista victory, they said:

"We are confident that our revolutionary process will be something original, creative, truly Nicaraguan and in no sense imitative. For what we, together with most Nicaraguans, seek is a process that will result in a society completely and truly Nicaraguan,

one that is not capitalist nor dependent nor totalitarian.'

The panorama five years later is very different. The majority of the bishops, at the prompting of Archbishop Obando y Bravo of Managua have withdrawn their support from the revolution; they have campaigned to remove the priest-ministers from their posts and have publicly criticized the Sandinista leadership for its handling of the crisis among the Miskito communities on the Atlantic Coast. They have repeated accusations that the education programs of the government are really political indoctrination and have expressed fears about atheism and totalitarian rule. This attitude has been criticized by Catholics who support the government, and the bishops have reacted by trying to reassert their traditional authority.

On June 29, 1982 the Pope wrote them a lengthy letter, criticizing the 'popular church'—a term never widely used in Nicaragua—but at the same time urging the bishops to be more understanding. The Pope used his visit to Nicaragua in March 1983 to repeat the message in his letter.

The measures taken by the Bishops' Conference to distance the Catholic Church from the Sandinistas have caused confusion and resentment among ordinary Catholics. The poor, who are the beneficiaries of the revolution, cannot understand this hostility. For most of the bishops, and for many middle-class Nicaraguans, however, the people, enrolled in mass organizations, unions, neighborhood communities and the militia, are a new and frightening phenomenon. No longer are they the hapless victims of repression, exploitation and poverty, seeking the successor of the church, but an organized social class wielding considerable power.

Archbishop Obando y Bravo has become a focus for members of the conservative opposition who threw in their lot with the Sandinistas when they failed to dislodge Somoza from power through negotiation, but who, within months of the Sandinista victory, became bitter critics of the new government which they were unable to control.

In the tense situation created by the 'contras' campaign, the government has reacted sharply to many of the bishops' statements, and any particular incident is likely to be exaggerated out of all proportion by partisans of either side.

Three incidents in particular have recently provoked conflict. In September 1983 the bishops denounced the newly promulgated conscription law as an attempt to mold conscripts to Sandinista ideology, and in their Easter pastoral letter of 1984 they called for unconditional negotiations with the 'contras'—a document publicly criticized in statements by the Jesuit and Dominican orders in Nicaragua, the Jesuits noting that the bishops had never condemned the 'contras' attacks. In July 1984, the government expelled ten foreign priests, apparently as a direct rebuff to Archbishop Obando y Bravo of Managua, who had organized a public march in support of a priest accused by the authorities of being a 'contra' agent. In August, after the nomination of Father Fernando Cardenal, SJ as Minister of Education, the Secretariat of State of the Vatican renewed its efforts to make the priest ministers resign their posts.

The evangelical churches, which claim 15 per cent of the population, have followed a more consistent path. From a tentative involvement with welfare work in the early 70's, they have passed through denunciation

of human rights violations to overt sympathy with the Sandinistas. This change has taken place in spite of a theological tradition originally hostile to social involvement and a marked suspicion of left politics. Change, of course, has not been uniform; nevertheless the majority of evangelical churches supported the fight against Somoza and have since been favorable to the new government and its programs.—Catholic Institute for International Relations, England. *Comment*, 1984. Quixote Center.

With that, I think I have said enough, other than to say that it seems to me as if we are inexorably headed for an enlarged conflict in which ultimately your children, my colleagues, those of draft age, are going to be fighting in the jungles to the south of us, quite unnecessarily, and I think mistakenly so.

I have offered suggestions. I have never been cast in the role of a panjandrum in any of the bodies I belong to. When I filibustered the race bills in the State senate, I did so as a freshman, which was unheard of in the annals of Texas Senate history. But the fact is that our system, if we uphold it, is the greatest, and the American people in turn are way above in stature than what our own leaders really accredit them with.

The people, my colleagues, are way ahead of us.

We have got the responsibility of trying to lead intelligently, knowledgeably, and that is an awesome responsibility in this day and time. But if we continue to be intimidated by a President who then reduces the issue to are you pro-Communist, are you giving aid and comfort to the Communists or are you loyal to me, and that is what the issue has been reduced to in the last 4 years. Now, somehow or other I still appeal to the overwhelming preponderant colleagues that we examine the issue on the merits and demerits based in turn on a realistic assessment of the facts involved.

We cannot continue to blunder. Our margin of error as to time is reduced very much in terms of the world in the 1980's.

Also, it dovetails with our equal misperceptions with respect to a world that is compelling you up to now, and Presidents to foist on the American people a horrendous war machine. We call it a defense budget. But it really is a war budget at \$315 billion which will be \$1 trillion in less than 2 years. I think that it is time we try to catch up with ourselves.

I still have, despite some demoralization, the optimism that we can do it. And tied in with that was what I started out originally, and that was to show how here in the world of Joel Barlow, that great American patriot, poet, he was a chaplain in George Washington's Revolutionary Army, he was a real revolutionary in the sense that that word really without perversion is

meant to be, but we live in a world in which words are perverted. We live in a true Orwellian sense.

I would like to point out what I started out to say yesterday and did not quite round out, which was the coming summit, economic meeting this next month in Bonn, West Germany, which I pointed out that no Member of the Congress has even used the words or much less referred to this emerging force that was first revealed at the summit, economic conference there also in Bonn in 1979, Jimmy Carter then being the President. And the development of the ECU, the European Currency Unit, and the EMF, the European Monetary Fund.

I want to point out to my colleagues, unlike 1979, these countries now, either the 6 or the 10, in the aggregate, have more gold than the United States. And we like to think that we have demonetized gold, but it is still there, and we foolhardily sold our gold reserves in 1975-76 with Secretary of the Treasury Bill Simon over a lone objection on my part. So I am used to having all of these. I have a big trunk, or chest, of lost causes, but I also have quite a number that have prevailed in the long run, because the system, and I think it still is, is beautiful.

□ 1740

If you are right, if you have any degree of competency in developing the position that is right, ultimately it is going to prevail, assuming you can survive long enough politically.

Now, in anticipation of the summit meeting I would like to place in the RECORD at this point an article on page A-27 of the Dallas Times Herald for Sunday, March 31, which is entitled "Volcker: World Economy Needs West German Aid."

Now, that sounds strange, "West German aid." That sounds strange. West Germany, the United States pleading to West Germany—

Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker on Saturday called for West Germany to shoulder more support of the world economy which he said has recently relied too heavily on exported United States money that should be staying at home.

Well, what have I been saying for 16 years? And the other article, because it also has a direct bearing on the first subject matter, a front page article in the Dallas Times Herald for Tuesday, March 26, entitled "Reagan Decries Mexico Corruption." It is bylined "Paul West of the Washington Bureau." In it Mr. Reagan is taken off much like Gen. Paul Gorman before him, who still is I believe in command of the Southern Command in Panama and who, quite frankly, told, and I wish my colleagues here who are advocating the opposite would listen, General Gorman, as much as he is against the Sandinista regime, said that unless



the United States did more directly, that is intervention, with our own soldiers, that the Contras couldn't win at all, no matter how much help we gave them. We have continued to give to them.

I have charged that the President has violated the laws. I know he has violated three of the basic treaties which is turn have completely eroded our capacity for moral collective leadership in the New World.

I think that it is not our might, it is not our guns, our tanks, our cannons; I think that what is really looked for in America more than anything else is more leadership.

As I have said repeatedly, and I will say it today, if I had my way, if it were in my power to do so, I would call back every single American soldier that we have placed south of the border, right now. And in lieu thereof, instead of a tank like the M-60 tanks that the Governor of Texas sent down there with the National Guard, but when they selected them they were going to select them from the Hispanic component in the dense Hispanic areas of south Texas. Why? Because they thought it would be good to have Spanish-speaking elements down there, it would be good for good neighborliness. Well, the truth is that it shows an ignorance of what those countries are all about down there, also an ignorance of what modern day Texans are, whether they are Hispanic or not.

So the Governor, who went to visit the day after Easter the troops and took a C-130 transport full of frejolas, beans, tortillas, and barbecues. I could have told him, I think, that I would say at least 80 percent of those troops down there, instead of that fare, which a lot of them consider to be a Gringo plot to poison them, they would have preferred to have had Wheaties, the food of champions, and a good cold glass of milk or a milkshake.

But, you know, you cannot break through this aura of stereotype thinking. Anyway, the Governor went down there and they sent M-60 tanks plus Scorpion British tanks. All I can say is that if we are not the laughingstock then I do not know what it is we are, in every country in the New World outside of the territorial bounds of the United States. But in the meanwhile the attack has been on the Mexican President, de la Madrid.

We have, through the CIA, been trying to destabilize, we have been trying to put pressure on him. One of the most popular books in Mexico recently was a novel based on a Presidential sellout in which the black coat and the black hat was the CIA of the United States. It was the most popular thing down there. We ignore all of that because we live in a world in

which every society is self-contained, not only ours but theirs.

So even we, living in Texas, will not even have a report of some of the most transcendental occurrences 300 miles south, below the border of Monterey. So that we are going to have to pay a price for that ignorance. I hope in time we can remedy that with some real enlightened leadership.

I have been critical, as I have said, not only critical but for every criticism I have voiced I have offered a suggested course of action.

Some of these I have advocated for more than 20 years. But the one that I have persistently advocated, I started on April 1, 1980, and certainly the President was not Ronald Reagan but was Jimmy Carter; but the forces there in place, just like the Army, the generals come and go, the CO's come and go, but the sergeant is the one who is there all along. They are the ones who are going to determine policy in many instances. Where you have these policy determinants who in turn have mindsets like the President, in which the stereotyped, outworn concepts are no longer valid, then we are going to have egregious error compounded upon egregious error.

I think the summit of error is when we try to destabilize a President like de la Madrid who is very, very personally pro-America. He was educated here, he likes the United States. But he is also a faithful, loyal son of Mexico. Mexico has always advanced two basic doctrines: nonintervention, no intervencion, and autodeterminacion, that is self-determination. And they have formed a group identical almost to the one that was formed in 1957 for the same reason, to arbitrate a border dispute which had flared into violence between Honduras and Nicaragua.

Those same countries banded together but the big difference was that President Eisenhower's Secretary of State had more brains. What they did, they did not have any compunction about getting together with them, they did not think it was below the dignity of the United States to get in and kind of even take the leadership, and that conflict was resolved after the group, with the United States as a copartner, went to the World Court. In fact it had been resolved until the recent eruptions which we have fostered through the CIA's destabilization tactics.

Now, the American people simply ought to be informed if nothing else. I think that if the American people have a full grasp of the facts, for example a President who says that he preaches frugality, wants us to cut all housing-assisted programs, even the FHA-Insured Mortgage Program; he wants to eliminate the Farmers Home Administration which provides rural housing for the rural poor and those

of moderate income. You know what a dilemma our real farmers are in right now. Well, the President wants to zero it out in the name of economy. But his own personal, Presidential executive discretionary budget, for which he does not have to account, has grown by 750 percent, 7.50 times in less than 2 years. Why? Well, I think if he were a man of candor he would not hesitate to come to the Congress and therefore to the American people and say, therefore, "Here is where I have been using it."

I happen to know where some of that money has been diverted. It coincides, this incremental increase or exponential increase, coincides with the Congress cutting off the direct appropriated funding for the Contras.

□ 1750

So that I think that the American people, once given the confidence of information and knowledge, will make the right judgments. I have never had that doubt, but I have always premised it on the American people being knowledgeable and being given the facts. And then I do not worry after that.

Those of us who stand up and proclaim where we are naturally assume responsibility for the utterances, always have. I do not think I would be here after 33 years in public elective office, from the lowest legislative representative capacity to the highest, if I had not been accountable.

I say that if we are wrong, but if we are honest, we admit to the wrong. I am of such a mind that unless that is the case, I will not yield, and I will persist even as the lonely number of one.

Because in our system, as I say and repeat: It is a wonderous—if you are right, and if you have any degree of competence in pushing that cause, you will be heard.

#### GRENADA DOCUMENTS: AN OVERVIEW AND SELECTION, PART III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of talks about the lessons of the Grenada documents and the documents which we captured from a Communist government and a Communist party when we liberated the Island of Grenada.

It is, I think, very useful to the average American to be able to look at what a Communist government and a Communist party says to itself in its secret documents.

This particular book, called "Grenada Documents: An Overview and Selection," prepared and released by the

Department of State, September 1984, is the most complete set of materials on a Communist government we have ever had. The first time we have ever captured material from a Communist government.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it is fascinating that in the second of these special orders, last evening, that one of our colleagues admitted, a colleague who normally would vote against aid to the Freedom Fighters, admitted, "I have absolutely no question that they had become allies of the Soviet Union," referring to Nicaragua.

Now if the Nicaraguan Communists are in fact allies of the Soviet Union, what does that mean? What lessons can we learn about the process of being an ally of the Soviet Union? Why should Americans worry about a tiny country in Central America a long way off?

Many Americans are not even sure exactly where Nicaragua is, or which Central American countries are above it or below it. People say to me, "Why should I be concerned about Nicaragua?"

My first answer is, that while we have a moral interest in freedom for everyone, while we have a concern in free governments for everyone, that there is a very practical, down-to-earth reason for Americans to be concerned about the Nicaraguan Communists.

The reason is, the Nicaragua offers the Soviet Union its first real base or colony on the American continent. For the first time on the American continent, there is a government which is directly allied with the Soviet Union.

Now we know that the Soviet Union is committed ultimately as a Communist state, to dominate the United States. We know that Soviet leaders spend their lifetimes studying how to undermine the United States. We know from Mr. Chevchenko's recent book, for example—the highest-ranking Soviet defector who ever has left the Soviet system—that he sat in on meetings where they systematically plotted how to destroy the United States where in fact people who today are still negotiating with the United States were negotiating on the one hand, while practicing and studying and thinking how to defeat us and destroy us on the other hand.

In that setting, if the Soviet Union is in fact a grave danger to America—and I think it is—what does it then mean if Nicaragua, as one of our friends admitted yesterday, is an ally of the Soviet Union?

Well, the Grenada documents are particularly helpful in helping us to look from the inside; at what it means to be an ally of the Soviet Union. Because in the Grenada documents, we begin to get some sense of, how do they work together? what are they trying to accomplish? who are they with?

I think, as you look at the Grenada documents, you will learn first of all that the Soviet Union was systematically involved in arming Grenada.

Let me quote first of all from the introduction by Michael Ledeen and Herbert Romberstein. They said, speaking of Grenada now:

From the beginning, Bishop and the other NJM leaders sought to bring Grenada into the Soviet orbit, and there are thousands of documents showing the intimate relationship that developed between the USSR and Grenada. Sometimes relations were embodied in formal treaties between Grenada and Soviet bloc countries, and such Soviet proxies as Cuba, Vietnam, and North Korea. On other occasions there were secret agreements, such as those for providing counterintelligence or surveillance equipment, training for agents, and so forth. We have included several of the treaties and party-to-party agreements that gave Grenada a vast quantity of armaments as well as military and political training. Thousands of weapons, far more than could have been required for the security requirements of the tiny island, were shipped by the Soviet Union and Communist-bloc countries. Overall, the documents (samples of which can be found in this book) showed that the Soviet, Cuban, North Korean, and Czechoslovakian agreements included the following items, which were to have been delivered by 1986:

Approximately 10,000 assault and other rifles;

More than 4,500 submachine guns and machine guns;

More than 11.5 million rounds of 7.62 mm ammunition;

294 portable rocket launchers with more than 16,000 rockets;

84 82 mm mortars with more than 4,800 mortar shells;

12 75 mm cannon with 600 cannon shells; 15,000 hand grenades, 7,000 land mines, 60 armored personnel carriers and patrol vehicles;

More than 150 radio transmitters, 160 field telephone sets, approximately 23,000 uniforms, and tents for about 7,700 persons.

By U.S. Department of Defense estimates, equipment found on the island (not all of it had arrived) would have been sufficient to equip a fighting force of roughly 10,000 men. Furthermore, there evidently were some plans for special forces, since the Soviets promised to provide an airplane capable of transporting 39 paratroopers, as well as other special equipment.

All of this made Grenada a real military threat to its neighbors, most of whom had only local constabularies rather than standing armies. And there was little question that the airport was going to be used for military purposes, since General Hudson Austin's deputy, Liam James, reported in his notebook on March 22, 1980, "The Revo has been able to crush Counter-Revolution internationally, airport will be used for Cuban and Soviet military" (Document 23). This apparently reflected a decision of the NJM leadership.

The Soviets appreciated the geopolitical significance of acquiring another proxy in the Western Hemisphere, as can be seen from the picturesque account of a meeting between Major Einstein Louison, Chief of Staff of the Grenadan Army (who had gone to Moscow for military training), and his Soviet counterpart, Marshal N.V. Ogarkov. According to the Grenadan notes on the meeting (Document 24), Ogarkov told Loui-

son, "over two decades ago, there was only Cuba in Latin America, today there are Nicaragua, Grenada and a serious battle is going on in El Salvador." The Grenadans saw themselves as Soviet proxies. Their Ambassador to Moscow, W. Richard Jacobs, reminded his comrades in Grenada that their importance to the Soviets would eventually depend on their success in exporting revolution:

□ 1800

To the extent that we can take credit for bringing any other country into the progressive fold, our prestige and influence would be greatly enhanced [sic] (Document 26). Jacobs felt that the first such project should be Suriname.

There was no lack of Soviet support for Grenadan intelligence and counterintelligence operations. A draft letter dated February 17, 1982, from General Hudson Austin to Yuri Andropov, then the chief of the KGB, requested training courses for three Grenadans in counterintelligence and one in intelligence work. Austin thanked Andropov for the "tremendous assistance which our armed forces have received from your party and government in the past."

Now, I cite this and I quote this to say to everyone that when we talk about being an ally of the Soviet Union we are talking first of all about a military alliance. We are talking about a commitment on the part of Grenada to work with the Soviet Union and in return we are talking about a commitment from the Soviet Union to prepare a country to be helpful. There is a fascinating parallel between the airfield that was being built in Grenada, which as these documents prove was in fact going to be used by the Cuban and Soviet military, and the airfield being built in Nicaragua today.

If I were to come here and say the Soviets have an aircraft carrier in the Caribbean, everyone would be very worried. Yet if I come here and say the Soviets are building an airfield in Nicaragua, which is a permanent aircraft carrier, somehow no one seems worried. In fact, the 12,000-foot runway being built in Nicaragua is a far more powerful base for aircraft than any aircraft carrier would be.

Combined with the Cuban bases, the Soviets have the equivalent of seven or eight or nine aircraft carriers in the Caribbean.

Now, if we were to have a news report tonight that there were eight or nine Soviet aircraft carriers in the Caribbean, every American would be worried. "Why are they there? What are they doing?" Yet as long as they build airfields in countries that are their allies, no one worries. But if there were a great crisis, if in fact for some reason in the Middle East or in Europe or in Korea there was to be a crisis, if the following week hundreds of Soviet airplanes were to land in Nicaragua and in Cuba, does anyone seriously believe that any of the people currently voting against aid to



the freedom fighters would suggest, "Oh, why don't we go in and take them out?"

Oh, no. Having first reassured us that Nicaragua was not really with the Soviets, then having reassured us that Nicaragua was not really building an airfield, then having reassured us that the Nicaraguan airfield was not really military, then having assured us that while the Nicaraguan airfield is military, it really was not dangerous, then finally having assured us that while the Nicaraguan airfield was dangerous, there were no Soviet airplanes, I do not think any reasonable, responsible person can believe that the left-wing Democrats who are voting against helping the freedom fighters would then rush to this floor and say, "Now that there are Backfire bombers there, now that there are Soviet aircraft there, now let us do something decisive."

And indeed I challenge any of our friends who intend to vote against aid for the freedom fighters to, at any time in the next few days, pledge at what point they would intervene, at what point they would be willing to do something drastic, because every day that we do not help the freedom fighters, we increase the danger of Soviet penetration.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman I think is making the critical strategic point about the importance of Nicaragua in describing it literally as an aircraft carrier.

Now, last night, the gentleman, along with our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], was on the floor with several of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle. And did not one of our Democratic friends last night concede that Nicaragua is indeed a client state of the Soviet Union?

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, our Democratic friend used a much stronger word. They conceded that the Nicaraguans were in fact the allies of the Soviet Union; in fact the exact quote, which I will be glad to read, is: "I have absolutely no question that they have become allies of the Soviet Union."

Mr. WEBER. If the gentleman will yield, let me just clarify again. The quote you just read, that Nicaragua is indeed an ally of the Soviet Union, came not from a Republican but from a liberal Democrat yesterday?

Mr. GINGRICH. That is exactly correct.

Mr. WEBER. Then it seems to me that the aircraft carrier that the gentleman is describing is a Soviet aircraft carrier; is that correct?

Mr. GINGRICH. That is correct.

Mr. WEBER. So the vote on aid to the Contras is really a vote on whether or not you want to give the Soviets an aircraft carrier in our backyard?

Mr. GINGRICH. I think it is fair to say that the vote on aid to the freedom fighters is a vote on whether or not you are willing to tolerate the establishment of a Soviet airfield, the equivalent of a Soviet aircraft carrier, a permanent aircraft carrier, on the North American Continent. And I think that to vote no is in effect to vote for permission to send a signal to the Soviet Union that it is perfectly reasonable for a 12,000-foot runway to be built by the Soviets, to be placed in Nicaragua by the Nicaraguan allies of the Soviet Union, so that at some future crisis, the Soviets should feel equally comfortable flying bombers and fighter planes into that airfield, because, after all, I would say to any American, "Do you honestly believe that the Soviet Union is building a 12,000-foot runway in a military setting, with military preparations, with revetments to hide the aircraft?"—and nobody disputes that this is a military runway, unlike the Grenadian situation, where our leftwing friends kept telling us it was not a military runway until, of course, we captured the documents where they said it was a military runway.

Even our leftwing friends concede, "Oh, yes, this really is a military airfield."

Now, do you honestly believe, does anyone honestly believe the Soviet Union is building a 12,000-foot runway not to use it, not to put aircraft on it, not to threaten the United States?

And of course not; there is no rational argument that says, "Oh, yeh, they are going to pour all of that concrete, build all of those revetments, have all of those bunkers, but, by the way, the Soviets are really reasonable people, and clearly they would not do anything to threaten America."

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman has sketched a scenario of the way the left treats many of these issues by pointing out that they will say right up until the time it happens that, oh, no, that is not going to take place—and I think he sketched it pretty well a few minutes ago.

Is the gentleman not sketching precisely what happened in Cuba, that if you take what happened in Cuba, all the way along, our liberal friends assured us that, oh, no, the Soviets had no real intentions of making Cuba into a client state of the Soviet Union, that this was simply something that was the imagination of conservatives in this country, but that now have to admit what we have created in Cuba is a nation which is a direct threat to the

United States and it is in fact being used as a Soviet base of operations throughout the Caribbean and being used as a Soviet base of operations against this country.

And in fact the gentleman has sketched exactly the process that was used by the left to continue to move away from any kind of action that the United States might have taken with regard to Cuba, and now we get on the House floor the rather interesting argument from some people on the left that if you are really so worried about Communist subversion in the Caribbean, why don't you do something about Cuba?

Well, the fact is the power has been coalesced in Cuba in such a way that to do something about Cuba at this juncture becomes extremely expensive for this country in terms of lives, in terms of everything else.

The left allowed Cuba to take place and now turns and uses it as a justification for allowing another Cuba to happen in Nicaragua. It is absolutely crazy what is happening out there.

I thank the gentlemen for yielding.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me just say, on the point about Cuba, that there is something maddening about our friends on the left who refuse to help freedom fighters who are willing to go out on their own, who refuse to stop communism and a Soviet ally in Nicaragua when it is still easy, who then turn and say, well, if you are all that frightened, why don't you do something about Cuba?

And I say again and again to my friends on the left, if you are willing to support any serious effort to bring pressure to bear on Castro, on the 9,000 Russian troops who are now in Cuba—9,000 Russian troops 90 miles off our shore—if you want to do anything, I would be delighted to cosponsor a bill. But the fact is, the left uses that as a mask behind which they are willing to vote no to helping freedom fighters today in a country where we have a very reasonable chance, without a single American being at risk, to simply eliminate the Soviet Communist danger to the survival of the United States.

I think there is something infuriating about this deliberate and, I think, clearly it is hard—one does not want to challenge anyone's sincerity, but it is hard to understand the kind of mind which would vote no to helping freedom fighters in Nicaragua and turn and offer the help to do something serious about Cuba, a much more difficult position.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield one more time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to

make one point. That is, that so often what we hear the left doing is being tough where they know there is no real issue. They are willing to be tough, for instance, to build a Stealth bomber that they know we cannot get for 10 years, they are willing to be tough about, let's stand up against Cuba, when they know that is not an action which this Government proposes to take.

□ 1810

They are willing to be tough everywhere except where you have got to really act, and at the point you have got to really act, then all of a sudden they are no longer tough; then defense does not matter; then they do not want to really take the steps necessary to protect the defense of this country.

That is the infuriating thing which happens so often in this body, is that we hear them talk a tough line, but the fact is, when they come to the question of whether or not they are going to act, then there is no point at which they are really willing to act.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me carry it one step further. There is something strange about the number of left-wing Democrats who are now, and one or two, frankly, ostrich Republicans who fit this, who are not eager and excited about helping freedom fighters in Cambodia; who are suddenly even excited about helping freedom fighters in Afghanistan. Both of those are distant countries in difficult situations where it is hard to get help. But when we come very close to home in Nicaragua, close to us, easy to help, where we could be effective, suddenly these people who are very eager to help distant freedom fighters are not willing to help local freedom fighters.

I would say that charity and help begins at home. That here in the Western Hemisphere we are going to help freedom fighters. Let us start with the freedom fighters who are closest where the threat is greatest.

I yield to my good friend from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree a great deal with what my colleague from Pennsylvania just said about what has happened in Cuba. You know, I just got back from Central America, and went to Nicaragua, and I talked to business leaders and religious leaders and political leaders, and without exception, except for the Sandinista Communist government leaders, everybody said that if the United States does not support the Contras, the repression will increase and the revolution will spread throughout Central America as Thomas Borja, Umberto, and Daniel Ortega have said it would.

One of the things that the gentleman from Pennsylvania alluded to a moment ago was the Cuban situation,

and the gentleman in the well talked about it. I would like to give you a scenario that I see developing in the months and years ahead if we do not aid the Contras.

President Kennedy, in 1962, adopted the Kennedy doctrine. He forced the Soviet Union to get their missiles and all offensive weapons and all troops out of Cuba. Today, we know they are all back there. They have Mig-23 fighter-bombers; they have troops; you alluded to 9,000 Cuban troops.

Mr. GINGRICH. 9,000 Soviet troops.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Soviet troops; correct. Because of that, our liberal colleagues tell us: "Well, we cannot be involved in a military conflict with Cuba because we invite a superpowers confrontation which could result in a nuclear holocaust."

I submit to you that if we do not support the Contras in Nicaragua, before long, we are going to see thousands of Soviet troops down there Mig-23 fighter-bombers there and all the military equipment that goes along with it. At that point, when the revolution spreads into these other countries, and we talk about taking off the head of Nicaragua to preserve our hemisphere, those people will be saying the same thing: "We cannot do anything about Nicaragua because we risk a confrontation between the superpowers, which could lead to a thermonuclear war."

We do not have to face that prospect if we give the people who are fighting for their freedom down there, the Contras, the wherewithal to do is right now.

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the gentleman from Indiana is precisely correct. I was in Nicaragua about 10 days before the gentleman from Indiana and found out precisely what he said is true. In fact, the beginning of the fortification of Nicaragua as an armed Soviet client-state is already underway.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. WEBER. I learned when I was there, and I would invite the comments of my colleague from Indiana if I have got my figures wrong, there are already I believe 8,000 or 9,000 Cuban troops already in Nicaragua. In addition to that, there are troops from East Germany, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia. There are PLO advisers flying the jet aircraft or flying the airplanes in Nicaragua. There are advisers from Libya, as well as representatives, I am told, of virtually every terrorist organization in the world including the Bader-Meinhoff gang from West Germany.

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I did not mean to imply that it is not already a

surrogate and the puppet of the Soviet Union and Cuba. What I meant to say was that right now there are not Soviet troops domiciled there and they do not have all the Soviet equipment like the Mig-23's, because the President has told them they better not bring them down there. But if we wait, like we waited with Cuba, that will be a Soviet stronghold, not just a Communist stronghold but a Soviet stronghold, and the argument the liberals will make is, we cannot do anything about it because we risk a nuclear confrontation. That need not occur.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say also if I might that if we are watching a Soviet-Cuban military buildup in Nicaragua under Ronald Reagan, can you imagine what would happen with a Jimmy Carter or a Walter Mondale as President? If they are willing to continue to take the risk of building up their military power under Reagan, who they know is tough and they know has got a pretty firm anti-Communist position, can you imagine the next left-wing Democratic President?

In fact, it was precisely under President Carter that the Russians reintroduced a brigade into Cuba and built up their offensive capabilities in Cuba.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. But they are depending upon the Congress. The reason why they will do it even in the face of someone who is taking a tough stance like Ronald Reagan is they know ultimately this Congress, and particularly this House, has the power to cut off Ronald Reagan from supplying the Contras and doing the kind of things that he knows are necessary to stop what they are doing. So in fact what the gentleman is defining is exactly why this vote is so important. Because they are depending upon this House to do what they know that a Walter Mondale or a Jimmy Carter would do if he was in the Presidency, and that is protect them in what they want to do.

The vote next week becomes very much a case of whether or not you are going to vote pro-Sandinista or whether you are going to vote anti-Sandinista Communist. That is the real question. There is no question here about the Contras. You are not really talking about the freedom fighters down there; whether or not you are voting for or against them. You are really talking about whether or not you are voting for or against the Communist Government of Nicaragua. That is what the vote will be all about next week.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say to my friend, too, that I think every liberal Democrat who has any hope of thinking about this issue, because there is no point in talking about the radical, left-wing Democrats who, frankly I think, are not going to ever think



about it; they are committed to an ostrichlike policy of just ignoring any of the data. But any liberal or moderate Democrat who has any hope of really thinking about this issue, should read the April 29 edition of the New Republic. Because in that edition of the New Republic they go back and they cite, and it is amazing, they cite the memoirs of the North Vietnamese officers who were involved in planning the final invasion of South Vietnam.

They cite, these North Vietnamese officers have now written their memoirs; they won, they get to write the books. So they have written books in which they said:

We watched the U.S. Congress, and when the U.S. Congress did A, B, and C, we then knew we could invade South Vietnam and get away with it.

Now, what we discover, and it is very clear in the Grenada documents. These are very smart people; they work a long time at taking power. What we learned in the Grenada documents is that they know how to work with Congressmen; they understand how the Congress is subdivided; they talk about it in some detail in the Grenada documents, and they talk about specific groups of Congressmen and specific staffs. They know how to manipulate the American press. There is a four-page letter in here from the American-born wife of the Cuban Ambassador, in which, in handwriting, she outlines exactly how to manipulate American newsmen.

They understand how to have collaborators in the churches, and that is the word they use in their document. They talk about collaborators in the churches, and they set up this fantasy island tour in which what they do is they bring people in who are gullible and innocent and naive and they brainwash them.

Now it is fascinating, we read a great deal in the last few days about Ortega. We have read particularly gullible ostrich in the news media who talks about Ortega and what a person Ortega is like.

That person does not seem to understand that Ortega's first great political action was exactly the same political action as Joseph Stalin. The first thing Ortega ever did that was famous was that he robbed a bank and was caught and sent to jail. The first thing Joseph Stalin did as a member of the Communist Party back when it was still rebelling against the czar of Russia, was that he robbed a bank and was sent to jail.

We talk about this poor guy who was jailed by Somoza, it is true; he robbed a bank. Now probably this will come as a shock to some of our ostrich friends, but probably if a left-wing radical in America robbed a bank, we would put him in jail. We would probably put a right-wing radical in America who robbed a bank in jail. This is an old-

fashioned clearly American way of behaving that is not fair to left-wing revolutionaries that we think if you rob a bank you should go to jail.

I just want to make this point: That Mr. Ortega, the dictator of Nicaragua, who is so nice to all those left-wing groups, is a man who started his career by robbing a bank, and by the way, he was released from jail when they kidnaped a large number of people and threatened to kill them if he was not released.

This is the kind of deliberate terrorism which is the base of the current Nicaraguan Communist government, and it is probably one reason the Soviets like the Nicaraguans: They have a similar history between Joseph Stalin and Ortega, of being bank robbers as the base of their political career.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1820

Mr. WEBER. If the gentleman will yield further, I was just going to reemphasize the point that the Communist dictator of Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega, was not, as popular mythology in this country would have it, a great battlefield hero of the Sandinista revolution who fought his way into power against the corrupt Somoza government. He was, in fact, in jail at the time that Eden Pastora managed to basically win the military victory that led to the ouster of Somoza. Had Pastora not liberated him from jail, he probably never would have gotten out in the first place. Pastora, of course, now is fighting along the Costa Rican border to topple the Sandinista government precisely because they are no longer Sandinistas; they are now Communists, and he is the real Sandinista.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I think this is an important point. We got asked by one of our colleagues on the floor last evening, "Who are these counterrevolutionaries down there? Who are these people that the President wants to support?"

Well, the gentleman from Minnesota has just told us one. The man who helped oust Somoza, who was the largest single force—

Mr. WEBER. Commander Zero was his nickname in the fight. He was the most popular general in the Sandinista rebellion.

Mr. WALKER. The man who carried out the military victory against Somoza is now fighting the Communists who have taken control of the government because he got thrown out of the coalition because he was serious. He wanted to put together a democracy and found out that the Communists did not want to do that.

He is not the only one. As a matter of fact, I have a whole document here of just who the people are who are among the freedom fighters. In fact, they are very upstanding people, people who do want to bring democracy to their country, and I think it is extremely important that we do understand that we are not talking about Somozistas here; we are talking about people who really are prodemocracy, and it is a doggone shame to hear them libeled the way they so often are by the liberals in this Congress.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman would yield further, I would like to elaborate upon that just a little bit.

All of the people who oppose what the Communist Sandinista government down there are doing are not the freedom fighters and the conservatives. I talked at dinner at the Ambassador's residence in Managua last week with a gentleman who is the head of the liberal party. Up until about 1 year ago he was the Labor Minister in the Communist Sandinista government, and he got his stomach full and he put together a ticket, a liberal ticket to run for office.

Philosophically the two of us agreed on almost nothing, but the one thing he said to me was if aid to the Contras is not continued or given by the United States of America, the repression will increase and the revolution, without doubt, will expand throughout Central America. So the freedom fighters who fought against Somoza, the Sandinistas whose revolution has been kidnapped and who are fighting together to try to overthrow the Communist government down there are not alone. There are even liberal members who are in the Sandinista government who have had their stomach full and they want to see a change.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me bring us back to what I think is the central point of this evening, which is, even if you are willing to stomach a Communist dictatorship, even if you are willing to kill freedom in Central America, even if you are willing to eliminate the freedom fighters who are the decent people who tried to overthrow Somoza and create freedom, as an American, you have to ask yourself, what does it mean when you have even some of the Democrats who are against helping the freedom fighters admit that Nicaragua is an ally of the Soviet Union.

Let me just read for a second from a couple of documents in the Grenada documents to give us a sense of this, because people say, "Oh, I bet he is afraid of something that is not real." Well, now we have captured the real documents. Here is an interesting one.

This is Document No. 13 of this book. It is called An Agreement Between the Government of Grenada and the Government of the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics on Deliveries From U.S.S.R. to Grenada of Special and Other Equipment. Under article I it says:

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall insure in 1980 to 1981 free of charge the delivery to the Government of Grenada of special and other equipment.

I would remind everyone that one of the charges was, as indicated in a secret document from the Grenadian Embassy in Moscow, that they tried to overthrow two governments; that their quota that year was Surinam and Belize. So they were getting a charge, sort of, "You go out and overthrow some government and we will send you more equipment." That was the Russian deal.

Article II, and I think this is very interesting in terms of the point the gentleman from Minnesota made about the 9,000 Cubans. Article II:

The delivery of the equipment listed in the annex to the present agreement shall be effected by the Soviet party by sea at the port of the Republic of Cuba. The order of the further delivery of the above equipment from the Republic of Cuba shall be agreed upon between the Grenadian and Cuban parties.

In other words, the Russians were not stupid. They were not going to suddenly send Russian ships straight into Grenada. They were going to send the Russian ships, which already go to Cuba anyway, to Cuba, the Cubans were going to repackage it, and we have it repackaged in some places in really interesting ways. We have weapons, for example, we captured that were listed as foodstuffs, that had boxes that said "Foodstuffs." They just happened to be rifles when you opened them up. It was a very interesting version of foodstuffs. When our liberal friends talk about how this is really a fight and if only we sent foodstuffs, they do not understand what the Russians and the Cubans mean by foodstuffs. In their case it is AK-47's.

Let me give you one more version out of this very same treaty, because it is a fascinating document which we captured and which we know is real. This is not some fantasy made up by somebody in order to scare people. This is a real document.

Article VI: "The Government of Grenada and the Government of the U.S.S.R. shall take all the necessary measures to insure keeping in secret the terms and conditions of deliveries.

I just want to report to my colleagues that when I went to Oxford to debate the Nicaraguan Vice President, the Communist Vice President of Nicaragua, the day before at the Chatham House he pledged publicly that there were no secret treaties.

First of all, I think that tells you a great deal about their contempt for Western democracies, that the whole idea of pledging publicly there are no secrets, if you think about it, it is just

wonderful. It is the kind of "Fantasy Island" bizarreness that only people who have real contempt for us would begin, because by definition, if it is a secret treaty you would lie about it being secret, so if you said there were no secrets and there were secrets, your lie was an effective way of covering up the secret. So here is a guy who thinks we are so stupid he publicly pledges there are no secrets; but in the second place, we know he is lying. And this is the most difficult thing for our many friends, particularly in the church groups, to appreciate because they go down and are sincere and naive and innocent and in a remarkably historically ignorant way walk up to this guy, this former bank robber turned Communist dictator, and they say to him, "Gosh, do you have any secret treaties? and he says, "Would I have any secret treaties? Of course I do not."

Let me then remind you that we have absolutely proof in Grenada that there were secret treaties and that furthermore they promised the Russians they would lie about them. They promised they would keep them secret, and by definition, if you promise to keep it secret, does that not mean you promise to lie if somebody says, "Do you have a secret treaty?"

In that setting I would say to you, as a historian, does it not strike every person listening as far more likely that in Nicaragua we are dealing with a parallel situation? Does anyone really think the Russians have changed in the last 2 years? Of course not. So what does that mean? It means that without any question, if the freedom fighters win and if the freedom fighters open up the archives of the communist government, what we will suddenly discover, and it is a much bigger list of treaties because the Nicaraguans are getting a lot more money. Now, if you figure two countries per \$6 million of aid, the amount of aid the Nicaraguans are getting, they must have volunteered 30 or 40 countries they would undermine, assuming that the same exchange rate of countries for aid was going on with Nicaragua that went on with Grenada.

I would say that the burden of proof is on the ostrich wing of the Democratic Party to explain to us how they could possibly believe, if they are willing to concede that Nicaragua is an ally of the Soviet Union, as one of them did, how could they possibly argue, I would love to hear their explanation, of why the Grenada book is not the most probable model of what is going on in Nicaragua, because I just think it boggles the mind to imagine that here we are, going to vote apparently next Tuesday, led by the Democratic leadership of this House, to in effect give the Soviet Union a permanent aircraft carrier in Nicaragua.

□ 1830

Now, I cannot understand, given the last 10 years of history, how anyone who has watched the Democratic leadership of this House, who has watched the effect of those votes over the years, could possibly stand by and have any sense of trust in the Soviet Union or its ally, the Nicaraguan Communist Government.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, just to follow up on that in a little different vein, the gentleman talked about the Soviets and the Cubans and the Grenadians lying about those treaties and agreements, and I talked to my colleagues in the last couple of weeks about arms shipments coming from Cuba and the Soviet Union, coming through Nicaragua and to the guerrilla fighters who are trying to overthrow the duly elected government in El Salvador, and they say that there is no proof of that going on.

I was in El Salvador last week, in Chalatenango province, and I saw a newly captured cache of weapons that were all Communist-originated—Yugoslavian mortars, Bulgarian hand grenades, and all kinds of weapons that you could follow directly all the way back to the Communist bloc. Yet they tell us that is not happening.

I would like to take a paragraph out of the letter that President Duarte sent to President Reagan. He said, and I quote:

We remain concerned, as we have been for some time, by the continuing flow of supplies and munitions from Nicaragua to guerrilla forces here in El Salvador which are fighting against my government and our programs of reform, democracy, reconciliation, and peace. This continuing intervention in our internal affairs is of great concern to us and we deeply appreciate any efforts which your government can take to build a broad barrier to such activities—efforts which a small country like El Salvador cannot take in its own behalf.

Yet when you talk to the liberal Democrats in this House, they say that is not taking place, while the president of the country where it is taking place and that is being affected documents it in his letter to our President.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has made an important point because it goes even deeper than that.

Many of our friends on the left know that in order to document that traffic into El Salvador, we would have to give up intelligence secrets of this country. Many of them have seen



those intelligence reports. They know doggone well that our intelligence can show that that kind of trafficking is taking place. So when they make those kinds of statements, what they are really saying is "We would like you to release that intelligence information."

Now, we all know what is going to happen if that intelligence information is released. It will give up our sources.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And they will be killed.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, and our sources will be killed.

So what they are really asking for is the kind of things which undermine the intelligence-gathering capacity of this country, which is in itself a help to the Soviet Union.

That is a very, very disturbing element, I think, to the fact that we hear all of this campaign from people who really, I think, know better. If they have not seen those intelligence briefings, they are certainly available to them as Members of Congress, and those intelligence briefings are very, very specific on the point that in fact the kind of gunrunning the gentleman has just referred to is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just continue this, if I might, for just a minute because I think people might say, "Well, there is only this one treaty with the Russians, and anyway most of the people in Nicaragua are Cubans, they are not Russians—most of the military advisers, most of the secret police trainers, most of the people who are doing the work."

Let me make two points. There is another secret treaty between Grenada and the Soviet Union which was signed and which said this. This is document No. 14, under article 2:

The delivery of the equipment listed in Annexes 1 and 2 to the present agreement shall be effected by the Soviet party by sea at the port of the Republic of Cuba. The order of the further delivery of the above equipment from the Republic of Cuba shall be agreed upon between the Grenadian and Cuban parties.

In other words, the Cubans became the control of the Grenadians. The Cubans began to have the power to say, "If you don't obey us and do what we want, you won't get the things the Russians are shipping to us."

Let me carry it one step further. Some of our leftwing friends who, I think, act as ostriches—

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to slow the gentleman down for a second, because I was listening very carefully to that point. That seems to

me to be a critical point, and I would just like to review it for a second.

As I understand it, what that agreement that the gentleman just read indicates is that the flow of arms and other materials to Grenada from the Soviet Union was literally brokered by the Cubans, and that there was a formal document with the Grenadian Government establishing that the flow of such arms and other materials to the Grenadians was to be procured by the Cubans. Is that correct?

Mr. GINGRICH. That is correct. Cuba acted in effect as the middleman for the Soviet Union in establishing a Communist dictatorship in Grenada, and the Cubans acted as the control point. So the Cubans had literal control over the Grenadian Government so at any moment they could choke off the flow of weapons.

Mr. WEBER. Of course, the point there is critical because, as the gentleman points out, there is a large number of Cuban troops and nonmilitary advisers in Nicaragua, so all of our past experience indicates that they are probably once again acting directly as the agents of the Soviet Government; is that not correct?

Mr. GINGRICH. That is correct. Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. And this is the same Cuba that some of our friends on the left have in recent weeks suggested we ought to be more compassionate to, we ought to be less hostile toward, we ought to be opening the doors more toward, and we ought to be trying to negotiate with? It is exactly the same Cuba, is it not?

Mr. GINGRICH. As the gentleman will remember, one Democratic candidate for President last year ran around all of Central America saying that the United States should not embrace dictators and then physically embraced Fidel Castro. I thought it was one of the most bizarre moments in modern American politics. Here is a guy who went to like six countries in a row and held press conferences and said that America should never again embrace a dictator, and he arrived in Havana and physically embraced Fidel Castro, as though Castro was not a dictator.

Let me continue now, and then I will be glad to yield, because I really want to drive this home. There is another document in the Grenada documents—and these, as I said earlier, are all available to the public; they are printed by the State Department, and I think they should be in every public library and every high school library and, I might say frankly, every church library. If churches are going to get involved in lobbying, and so forth, they ought to read the Grenada documents. Every church group in America should

read this document and have a study circle to ask, what does this mean? If they look at document No. 16, which is protocol of the military collaboration between the Government of the Republic of Cuba and the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada, they will discover this article 12, which I think is very, very important for all of our ostrich friends on the left to listen to and think about:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba and the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada will take all measures depending on them in order to assure the secrecy of the permanency of the military personnel in both states and the character of activities, as well as the mail and information relating to present protocol.

Now, what does that mean? Not only is this the secret treaty on which they rely, but notice the keyword, I say to those of our friends on the left who always rush in after the next Communist government gets set up and say, "Oh, well, this is all temporary. If we are reasonable, they will back off." The keyword here is "permanency."

This was a permanent treaty of alliance between the Cuban Communist Government and what was then the Grenadian Communist Government. And what does that say about Nicaragua? It says that Nicaragua is the permanent ally of the Communist Government of the Soviet Union and the Communist Government of Cuba as long as we allow that Communist government to survive.

And on the vote next Tuesday, if anyone votes no next Tuesday, they are voting to kill the freedom fighters' chances of stopping communism in Nicaragua, and they are voting to increase the potential for a Soviet airbase in Nicaragua.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make it clear that in my mind there is a threat to the security of the United States of America by allowing the Communists to expand their foothold on the North American Continent in Central America.

John F. Kennedy was President in 1962, and in 1961, in making an address before the American Society of Newspapers, he was talking about the Cuban threat, and I want to quote him because he was talking about the security of America. This is one of the most popular Democratic Presidents who has lived in our century.

He said this:

Any unilateral American intervention, in the absence of an external attack upon ourselves or an ally, would have been contrary to our traditions and to our international obligations.

And then he went on to say this:

But let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible. Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of non-interference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this Hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our Nation.

He was concerned about the Communists trying to get a toehold on our continent in Central America, and he was alluding to that in this speech. You can go on and read it, and it spells it out even more graphically as the speech progresses. But he said that American intervention may become necessary.

Now, if we do not support the freedom fighters down there and if this revolution expands, we are going to have to do that, and it is not necessary. But here was a Democratic President who made that commitment back in 1961.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me build on what my friend just said because I think it is really important and it also, frankly, frames our next speaker. I really think this is important.

President John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address said, "Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas, and let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house."

□ 1840

He went on to say later, speaking about the aggressors:

We dare not tempt them with weakness, for only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

The greatest tragedy to befall the cause of freedom in the last 20 years has been the collapse of the pro-defense, anti-Communist wing of the Democratic Party. Its replacement by a George McGovern, Walter Mondale wing, what I would call an ostrich wing, a wing in which the ostrich has replaced the donkey as the primary symbol, a wing in which ostrich Democrats seem to be unable to understand the nature of communism. They seem to be unable to understand John F. Kennedy's speeches. They seem to be unable to even read the Grenada documents and understand what they teach us. The ostrich wing of the Democratic Party, I think, is driving those Americans who used to be proud Democrats, but who fear communism and are concerned about America's survival and the survival of freedom, have been driving more and more of them, frankly, to leave their party. It is a tragedy for freedom.

One man who has personally witnessed it and lived through it and seen it is the very distinguished gentleman

from Florida [Mr. IRELAND] and I would like to yield to him at this time.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to register my support for the President's peace plan by first enumerating some of the issues upon which all sides agree, and the historical facts pertinent to them. Today we find ourselves in remarkable agreement regarding the problems and dangers in Nicaragua, with disagreement restricted primarily to how we might best solve those problems, or indeed whether we should attempt a solution at all.

First, I think it is generally agreed that the nature of the current Sandinista government is repugnant to both the American citizens and their elected representatives. Offers to the democratic opposition of so-called electoral participation fooled none. Sandinista harassment of opposition leaders cost them the support of even their more tolerant European sympathizers. This tactic was merely part of the long-practiced Sandinista policy beginning with ignoring promises made to the OAS which secured international support for overthrowing the Somoza regime in 1979. The Sandinistas are openly Marxist-Leninist—it is a Communist regime. They are implementing not just the Marxist socialism which has contributed to the country's economic ruin, but also the Leninist principles of mass organization and oppression which eventually can give them totalitarian control over their citizenry. The Sandinistas are not agrarian reformers, they are Communist revolutionaries whose No. 1 priority is to consolidate their regime.

Second, once such a government has consolidated its power, we have not, since the birth of communism in 1917 witnessed its overthrow or a significant reversal in its human rights policy. Once the iron curtain has closed, its unfortunate inhabitants have been locked behind it. The only countries in which there is a present hope of such a reversal are those—such as Afghanistan, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia and Nicaragua—where the government has not yet consolidated its political power. And where there exists a viable armed resistance movement.

Third, the domino theory is real. Nicaraguan Communist expansion to the north and to the south will focus on two strategic targets important to the United States. Mexico on our immediate border and the Panama Canal and the Caribbean sea lanes that supply our allies and friends. Through nonconventional guerrilla insurgencies, the Sandinistas will promote their brand of terror and destabilization throughout Central America.

In short, the Sandinistas will say, do and promise anything in order to gain enough time to consolidate their regime. There are only two choices,

first, to support the President's peace plan which promotes the Contadora process and offers an opportunity for a peaceful resolution of the conflicts in Central America or support the consolidation of the Marxist-Sandinista regime and strengthen the Leninist bonds of the Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan axis.

Talk is cheap and promises are easily broken. Prolonged negotiations and alleged regional "settlement" may not be the Sandinistas preferred option, but even this would give them what they need most—time for internal consolidation. Once the Nicaraguan people are fully controlled, promises can be broken, as they were in the past, and the details of "verification" rendered irrelevant. At that stage the Sandinistas will supplement propaganda and political action with more overt infiltration, terrorism and insurgency against their neighbors. Even if a "settlement" can now be achieved, it will be a temporary palliative only, and the future threat will be worse than that which now exists since we will face a stronger enemy with a secure base of operations. The Sandinistas must either be forced to allow opposition freedom and to accept the moderation in policy which this entails or they must be banished from government. Only the Contras can force them to face this choice.

Wars are not pretty, and the Contras are not perfect, but they are our only alternative to something far worse. Although the countries of Central and Latin America boast a democratic tradition superior to that of other less-developed regions, they too have serious vulnerabilities. Topography and borders also lend themselves to insurgency. There are lucrative strategic targets both to the south of Nicaragua, in the Panama Canal, and to the north, in Mexico, which is the largest supplier of U.S. oil imports and the ethnic fatherland of many U.S. citizens.

We cannot grant totalitarians control of Nicaragua on the theory that this will permanently slake Sandinista ideological ambitions. The democracies erred grievously before World War II when they ignored Churchill's insight and logic. We, who have experienced not just a decade of Nazism but also nearly seven decades of communism, have no excuse to repeat those errors.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman's comments because I think the gentleman puts in context our fears that we are seeing the rise of a true Communist state in Nicaragua and a state which is allied with the Soviet Union against the survival of the United States.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. He could not be more



correct. We need to have our colleagues and the American people pay close attention. It is so important to have this dialog move forward in a measured pace, rather than a rush to judgment as some of the leadership of this body would have us do.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER.]

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I think it is a historic thing that the gentleman from Florida is here today speaking as he is, because that perhaps answers the question that was put forth by one of the great Members of this House, the gentleman from Texas, CHARLES WILSON, during the last major debate that we had concerning the military strength and the MX missile. The question that he asked, if I can paraphrase it; CHARLES WILSON said essentially, "What has happened to the Democrat Party of Jack Kennedy, of FDR, and Harry Truman, who were strong on national defense and strong on foreign policy?"

The gentleman from Georgia has articulated some of John Kennedy's statements.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has given some other statements.

The Democratic Party was renowned for years and years for having a tough foreign policy. The answer perhaps to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], that is, what has happened to the Democrat Party of John Kennedy, FDR, and Harry Truman, is that they are alive and well and they are following people like PHIL GRAMM and the gentleman from Florida, ANDY IRELAND into the Republican Party.

Let me say that perhaps I should welcome that as a Republican and I do welcome these esteemed colleagues coming forth and rejecting what they see as a major weakness in the Democrat Party; but I would much rather see our Democrat friends standing up on that side of the aisle saying, "We are going to renew that Democrat platform of Jack Kennedy and FDR. We aren't going to give away our hemisphere."

I think the statements of the gentleman from Georgia have been right on point. The question is not only whether the Sandinistas are good people or bad people or have committed atrocities. Certainly they have committed them. Certainly they have denied democracy in this country and certainly they have reneged on the promises they made to the OAS; but beyond that, they are providing a Soviet presence in our hemisphere. They are doing exactly what John Kennedy said he would stop. They are doing exactly what Harry Truman said he would stop. They are doing exactly what

Dwight Eisenhower said he would stop. If in fact we fail in this vote to give some aid to the Contras, to the freedom fighters, then we are going to be acquiescing to that Soviet adventure in our own hemisphere and we are going to be allowing this and the Democrat side of the aisle is going to be allowing what some of the most celebrated and revered Democratic leaders of this country have said they would stop, and that is an outside power coming into our hemisphere and establishing a presence that is a threat to the United States.

If you look at the Backfire bomber, we were debating the Backfire bomber and other strategic systems that the Soviets had recently and one of my friends from the other side of the aisle said, "You know, Backfire bombers don't have the range, so you really can't count them as being long range strategic bombers."

People will look at the potential airfield built in Nicaragua and the airfield in Cuba, you realize that all of a sudden those Backfire bombers that have the capability of flying from Russia to the United States and dropping 26,000 pounds of nuclear warheads in the Midwest of the United States suddenly become in fact capable of doing that mission because now they have a place to recover. They do not have enough fuel to fly back the way they are designed to the Soviet Union. They do have enough fuel to recover in Central America. That is why that 10,000-foot runway in Grenada was so important to us. That is why those runways that they are constructing in Nicaragua are so critical to us.

I know the gentleman remembers in that book that he has that was put together by our historians that was derived from some of the 26,000 pounds of material that we captured in Grenada, he recalls a statement that was made in the secret central committee meeting after Ronald Reagan showed the American people the overview, the photographic evidence of that 10,000-foot runway in Grenada, and he said, "This runway is going to be used by Soviet airplanes, possibly airplanes like Backfire bombers that are recovering in Central America." The next day the press said that is baloney. They are going to ship spice through it just like they have told us. That secret central committee meeting resulted in one member recording in the meeting that it is agreed that the runway will be used by the Cuban and the Soviet military.

□ 1850

So the Grenadians lied to us, the Grenadian Marxist leader, and Ronald Reagan was absolutely right about this military threat. And we can expect only the same from the Nicaraguans.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding because I simply want to reemphasize a point just made by a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee in this body. I think what I heard the gentleman saying is that even if no Backfire bomber ever ended up being put on the runway in Nicaragua, that runway in the hands of a Soviet ally is still a threat to us because at that point a first strike launched by the Soviet Union using Backfire bombers would, in fact, be able to use that runway to recover after a bombing mission on the mainland of the United States. Is that what I understood the gentleman to be saying?

Mr. HUNTER. That is absolutely true. There are people, mostly on the other side of the island, the United States, who claim that the only bombers the Soviet Union has today that can be counted are these old propeller-driven Bear bombers because they claim the Backfire bomber does have the capability, it is a swept wing jet aircraft that can go faster than the speed of sound, and can deposit 26,000 pounds of nuclear payload in the United States. But we cannot consider that to be a long range bomber, and we cannot consider that to be something that should be part of the SALT treaties because, after all, it then does not have the fuel to go back to Russia. So theoretically a Soviet crew cannot leave Russia and come and bomb the United States and return to the Soviet Union.

But it can recover in Central America, so that is why those runways, those 10,000-foot runways in Central America are so very, very deadly to the United States.

Mr. GINGRICH. So potentially a no vote on Tuesday against aid for the freedom fighters is a vote which as a consequence could have Soviet nuclear bombers having a base in Nicaragua against the United States?

Mr. HUNTER. That is right. It gives an added effectiveness of 200-plus extra strategic bombers to the Soviet Union that are in their inventory and can be, can practically be used in a strategic attack against the United States.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think every American citizen should think about that between now and Tuesday. If your Congressman or your Congresswoman votes no on Tuesday, they are in effect voting for a policy which increases the likelihood that the Soviet Union would have a nuclear air force base in Nicaragua.

Mr. HUNTER. That is right.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the Speaker.

#### THE ELECTION IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the Members back, if I might, and those who today are within my earshot, to 1972, to the Olympics in Munich, Germany. Some of you may recall the basketball game that was played in those Olympics between the United States and the Soviet Union.

At the end of that basketball game the Soviet Union was behind by one point. The United States had won the basketball championship at the Olympics. But there was a referee who came from an East German country and he decided that they would roll back the clock for 3 seconds and replay those last 3 seconds.

They did so. They did not get off another shot, and at the end of the 3 seconds the United States won the basketball game by one point.

The referee again decided that they would replay those last 3 seconds once again at the end of it and once again gave them a second chance, gave the Soviet Union a second chance to win the Olympic basketball game.

They did. They got off a shot and sure enough, at the end of the second replay of that Olympic basketball game the Soviet Union won that Olympic championship.

Mr. Speaker, what is the point? Does it remind you of anything that is going on today in this body?

It does. I am talking, of course, about the election, the election which has been going on since November 6 in the Eighth District of Indiana, an election which was won by Mr. Rick McIntyre, the Republican candidate for the House of Representatives in that district. It was won on election night, and then it was recounted. And the election was won again on the recount by Mr. McIntyre.

But that was not enough. This House did not seat Mr. McIntyre and they decided they were going to undertake their own count. And so we have gone through the process again of this time the House of Representatives devising its own rules on how they would count the ballots in the Eighth District of Indiana. This time with the House of Representatives stacking those rules in such a way that they would do everything they could to guarantee a victory for the other side.

Now we are at the end of that second recount, the third election to take place in Indiana's Eighth District in the last few months, and they still

have not been able to win the election. It is a dead heat. It is a dead heat. Out of 230,000 votes that are cast, the election is virtually a dead heat.

Now we are coming down to Friday of this week when the task force that is assigned to look into that election will have to go to Indiana and face the voters and the citizens of that district and tell them what they are going to do. They have done everything they can to keep the Eighth District from being represented by Mr. McIntyre. They have done everything they can to structure the rules of the recount in such a way that they would win this election.

Now they are going to have to go and tell them what they are going to do. So I think that now, as we come to the end of this very, very long and arduous period that has been difficult for either of the candidates in that election, I might add, as we come to the end of this recount I think it is fair that this House, which is going to have to deal with this issue again, as we have dealt with it on January 3 and time and again since then, as we have insisted that the time has come for the winner, that certified winner in the Eighth Congressional District election to be seated, I think it is appropriate that we take some time now to review all of the events that have taken place since November 1984 and look at that election so that the American people will know exactly what has transpired during this election.

Let us remember, there has never been a question, a suggestion by anybody of fraud. There has never been a suggestion that this election was done unfairly, that the recount, that the count was handled incorrectly, that the tallies were done improperly. There has never been the suggestion of any illegality. Nobody has filed any charge under the Federal elections law. Nobody has made such a claim during the whole course of this election.

So on election night, November 6, the winner was Rick McIntyre. There was a period there for a few hours, actually about 48 hours, when one county reported incorrectly its tally, and it would appear, would have appeared that Mr. McCloskey was ahead by about 72 votes. But that was based on a clearly improperly added up tally, not on the basis of any counts of votes, just that the numbers when they were added on the bottom column came out differently.

A few days later the courts in Indiana directed the clerk in that county to add up those figures again. It does not take very long with the pocket calculators we have these days to do that. He added them up and, sure enough, the figures came out and showed that Mr. McIntyre had won that election.

Yes, it was a close election. It was a razor-thin margin. But he won that

election. And the secretary of state issued a certificate on that basis, issued a certificate to Mr. McIntyre that he was the actually elected and duly certified winner of the election in the Eighth District of Indiana.

Well, we all know what happened. When we arrived here on January 3 to be sworn in, along with Mr. McIntyre I came also as a freshman Member of this body to be sworn in. I did that day raise my hand and take the oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. My certificate that came with me as a duly elected Member of the Fifth District of Arizona was not in question.

Yes, I had a close election. No, it was not as close an election as Mr. McIntyre had, but it was a close election.

#### □ 1900

But nobody suggested fraud in my case. Nobody suggested that I should not be seated because I had a close election. I think when we get to it, at the end of this discussion today or at the end of all the discussions that we have had with this, when you strip away all the other things that are said about the election in Indiana's Eighth District, there is one and only one difference between the election that was held in my case or the election that was held in the case of each of the other 434 districts of the United States, and that is that this one was exceptionally close, close. That is all that was different, it was close. But there was a winner. That winner was certified.

But we know what the next step was. The Democratic majority in the House of Representatives refused to seat Mr. McIntyre on the floor of this body saying that they needed to take a look at this election, that it was too close an election, and there were, by golly, some charges that were made about some irregularities, apparently reading some newspapers or listening on the phone to somebody who might have called up. No formal statement ever issued, no formal charge ever issued under the Federal election law. But they were going to take a look at this election because it was a close vote and the House had a responsibility to look at that.

So he was not seated.

After all, they make the point, there is a recount going on right now in Indiana, and we ought to wait and see how that recount comes out. It should not take too long. Another couple of weeks and the recount in Indiana was completed.

The outcome, as we know, was very clear. Mr. McIntyre won the election again, this time by a substantially wider margin. In fact, under that recount, as the figures that now stand as the only official figures under Indiana election law as to what the outcome of



that election in the Eighth District was, Mr. McIntyre won that election by more votes than some Members who now sit in this body won their election by. Not very many of us won as close as that even under the recount, but there are Members who were seated whose certificate was accepted in this body who won by less votes than Mr. McIntyre did on the recount.

Well, you would have thought that the recount, having been undertaken by Indiana in complete conformance and compliance with its own law on the handling of recounts, would have settled the issue once and for all, and the majority in this body would have said let's get on about our business, "OK, we have assigned this thing to the House Administration Committee, to the task force, and we will continue to let them take a look at this issue, but in the meantime there can be no question, there can be no question but that Mr. McIntyre, with his certificate, ought to be seated on the floor of the House of Representatives." But, no, they did not do that. That was not the decision that was made. Instead, they refused once again to seat him because, though the Republican minority asked them to comply with what has been the precedent in virtually every single case that has ever been heard in this body, they refused to seat him, and we went right on with the recount.

That was done.

Now we are going to do the recount under the rules set up by the House of Representatives, by the task force of the House Administration Committee.

Despite the efforts since that time to resolve this matter and to seat the individual, pending the outcome of that investigation and that recount, who carries the certificate from the secretary of state, they have not done so.

Now, the recount that was undertaken by this body, by the House Administration Committee, is a very interesting process because of course they decided what the election law ought to be in Indiana. They decided what ought to be fair about which votes ought to be counted and which ones ought not to be counted. They restructured the rules for the recount in such a fashion that they—they restructured those rules for the recount in such a fashion that there was no doubt in their minds how the next recount would come out, the one that they were going to undertake. This time they put the rules, we will get to that in a bit in the course of this discussion, they restructured the rules in such a way that surely the ones that were not going to get counted and the ones that were going to be thrown out were the ones in the stronghold for Mr. McIntyre and the ones that were going to get counted were contrarywise in the opponent's. And, despite the fact that

they did these rules and despite the fact that they covered it with this patina of fairness by getting the General Accounting Office into the business of conducting this recount, despite all of these things, here we are now more than 90 or 100 days later, we are now at the end of that third election in the Eighth District of Indiana, and it is a dead heat. They still have not been able to get their person as the winner in this election.

I think it is interesting to observe in the Indiana election law on this point there has never been any suggestion that Indiana law was wrong. Sure, Indian law may be different than the election law that exists in your State or in my State, but each of us presumes that our States have the right and the authority to adopt the election laws under which each of us will get ourselves on the ballot, so long as it is not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States; that each State has the ability to adopt its own election laws which say when people will be registered, how they will register to vote, what kind of information will be on there; that each State has the authority to adopt its own election laws which govern the conduct of the election on election day; that each State has the authority to adopt its own election laws which govern how you will conduct absentee ballots, and, yes, Mr. Speaker, when there is a vote, an election that is challenged, that each State shall have the authority to enact its own election law which will govern how a recount will be done. There is no question that Indiana has the right to do this.

Let me just give you one suggestion: In my State, Arizona, we are unique in one respect in the law on registration. We have a longer period from the close of registration to the election date than any other State in this country.

In order to vote in Arizona you have to be signed up and registered 50 days before the election. You have to be on the rolls 50 days before.

Most States have 30 days, or 20 days, and there are a number of States that you can go in on election day and vote.

Now, if this task force had said, "Well, that is erroneous, it is too long a period, people aren't thinking about an election 50 days beforehand, they ought to be able to go in 20 days beforehand and register to vote and be allowed to vote in the Fifth District of Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]." If they had done that, what would they do? Would they go out on the streets and pull everybody and say, "Did you intend to vote if you have forgotten to register?" Of course not. We presume that each State has the authority to enact its own election laws, that it should govern its own election laws. That is indeed why the certificate that each of us brings from the Secretary of State

or the appropriate elected official in each of our States is so critical, because it is the certificate that we bring that certifies us by the election authorities in our own State, as the duly certified winner of our race.

Mr. McIntyre was no different in that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

I think he has laid out the chronology of events surrounding this so-called McIntyre controversy very accurately.

Let me just say something and recall a similarly contested seat which occurred several years ago when Mr. HENDON of North Carolina lost his seat following the 1982 election.

You know, he had a very unusual case there because Mr. HENDON, according to a Federal court, won that particular seat. In this situation you had a lever that you could pull in North Carolina that would vote for the straight Democratic Party. It was the party level; if you pulled that thing you could vote for everybody there who had a "D" after their name.

□ 1910

But in Mr. HENDON's district, at least in a number of the counties, you had people who wanted to, they wanted to vote Democrat almost all the way through, and they pulled that Democrat lever, but then they went over and they very clearly marked an X next to Mr. HENDON's name, next to the Republican's name.

Yet, when the clerk counted up those votes, they counted the ballots in which the voter had marked an "X" next to Mr. HENDON's name for his opponent.

Mr. HENDON took that case to the Federal court, and the Federal court said this about it. They said:

The imposition of a legislative preference for the straight party candidate when the voter has indicated no such preference is an arbitrary subversion of the electoral process. It serves no compelling state interest.

They continued:

We conclude that the legislative directive to count an improperly split ballot as a vote for the straight party ticket is unconstitutional.

Here you have a Federal court saying it is unconstitutional to say that when a guy puts his X next to Mr. HENDON's name, you count it for the other guy. This provision of the statute denies the equal protection of the laws to both the voter and the opponent of the candidate named in the straight party ticket.

That is *Hendon v. North Carolina State Board of Elections*, 710 Fed 2d 177, 4th Circuit, 1983.

And yet even with those credentials, Mr. HENDON came before this body and asked this body for a recount, this

body, the Democrat leadership of this body, which controls the body right now and did then—denied him a recount.

The reason they gave for denying the recount was the other feller, by gosh, had the certificate, and the certificate was what was important.

So here you had a case where you actually had a Federal court ruling the election to be unconstitutional; at least the manner in which they counted the ballots, you did not have a question on how the ballots were counted, you had ballots that had X's on them next to Mr. HENDON's name, the Republican's name, and those were counted as Democrat votes, or votes for the Democrat candidate.

This body said: No, the certificate is the important thing, and the certificate preempts the fact that these ballots were in fact counted in an unconstitutional manner, and they denied Mr. HENDON his seat.

Now here you have Mr. McIntyre come along, you have him with a duly issued certificate, along with the recount that says that he is a winner, and he is denied a seat. And I have never had it explained to me by a member of the Democratic leadership how those two sets of circumstances can be reconciled, and how that inconsistency can possibly be erased by the process we are going through right now.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] for his comments. As he was talking, it made me think of a couple of points.

One of the things we have heard—let me just add, I should say parenthetically, that I suspect you will never get the explanation of why the two were treated differently, because there is no real explanation for it; there is no justification whatever for treating these two cases in such obviously different manners.

One of the points that has been made frequently on this floor by people on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished gentlemen and gentlewomen on the other side of the aisle, has been that Indiana has changed its election law. So clearly there must have been some problem in Indiana, with the election law, that they changed this.

Certainly we ought to take that into account and we ought to be using the election law which has been enacted in Indiana as we recount these ballots—not that that necessarily would have made any difference at all, but that we ought to be taking that into account.

In the case you cited in North Carolina, of course, you had a Federal judge which struck that provision down, flat out struck it down; said this is unconstitutional and you cannot do that. Subsequently the North Carolina Legislature changed its law in that

regard. They changed the law about how those are to be done.

It was never suggested here that we ought to go back and recount and reseal for 2 years before Mr. HENDON on the floor of this body, because the law was struck down and it was changed—no, they said he did not have the certificate; his opponent had the certificate.

That was what the election officials in the State of North Carolina had ruled; that his opponent was the duly elected individual, and he brought that certificate and this body seated that person.

Now I think this body certainly ought to have looked at the election and the way it was conducted, but I think they were perfectly within their rights, pending the outcome of such an investigation, to seat the individual who brings the certificate.

And that, for the last 100-plus days, is all that we have asked of this body: to give the presumption to the individual.

Mr. HUNTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is absolutely right. You know, if you look at some of the very close votes that we have had, I think the MX missile passed by six votes. If three votes had been changed out of the entire House, that vote would have failed, and the MX missile would not have been funded.

And I say that, realizing that some people are on one side of the fence with regard to the missile; others are on the other side of the fence. The point is that that vote, that single vote that Mr. McIntyre could have been casting the last 120 days is very important, not only for the people of his district in Indiana, but also to the United States and to our foreign and domestic policy.

There is absolutely unequal treatment that has been accorded by the Democrat leadership to challengers of election results from the two parties. There is no way to reconcile the Hendon case with the McIntyre case.

During this past election, we had another close election, too; I think we had a close election with our friend George Hanson from Idaho. He, I think, was declared to be the loser by some 74 votes, and I know that he had some questions about votes particularly that might have been cast by out-of-state people who were not really residents.

We could have moved not to have seated the gentleman who defeated George Hanson; I think that is Mr. STALLINGS; but we did not do that. I think most Members of the Republican side of the aisle voted overwhelmingly to go ahead and seat Mr. STALLINGS, because he had the certificate,

which is a standard that this institution has always honored, except for one case when the secretary of state himself—and I think it was an Indiana case—sent an affidavit to the House of Representatives saying, "I've made a mistake," and in that case they did not seat him.

In all other cases, they have honored that certificate, and there is absolutely unequal treatment here and it has done a disservice to the people of Indiana as well as to the people of the United States, and certainly to the gentleman who worked so hard for that election, Mr. McIntyre.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Is not it true that in the case of Hanson versus Stallings that there was an election that irregularities have been charged in already; that there were charges made?

Mr. HUNTER. That is right.

Mrs. BENTLEY. And in the case of the McIntyre race, there have been no charges of irregularities?

Mr. HUNTER. That is right. There has been nobody saying that there has been any underhandedness; in fact, as I understand, most of the election officials in the counties, in Mr. McIntyre's district, are Democrats; the people who put the rules in effect and regulated the elections and declared Mr. McIntyre to be the winner.

So your are absolutely right; it is a matter of the Democrat leadership in this House exhibiting no faith and credit to the State authorities that we have relied on for 100 and some years to govern, at least initially, our elections.

Mrs. BENTLEY. If the gentleman would yield further, this of course makes it look like down the road all of us could face a problem of the same kind.

Mr. HUNTER. I think the gentlewoman has hit the nail on the head. What I see the Democrat leadership saying potentially, at least implicitly, to challengers throughout this country is, that if you are a Democrat, you do not have to quite get 50 percent of the vote; come close and we will see what we can do.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman from California for his earlier remarks, as well as the gentlewoman, and I will be happy to yield to her further if she would like.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to comment on the point that he made about the case in North Carolina, because I think the distinction is very obvious; that we cannot see any way to rationalize the two different ways in which these cases were decided.

Nor can we, if we look through the course of the recount, figure out how this recount is being undertaken.



I mention in my remarks earlier, and I think it is a serious statement to make, that the rules of the recount have been structured in such a way as to favor an outcome for Mr. McCloskey.

Well, let me tell you one of the things that the task force decided to do in this recount: They decided, one of the issues that had been raised earlier, of course, was that in some counties there were ballots that had not been counted because they had not been properly notarized, they had not been properly initialed, rather, before they were dropped in the ballot box; they had various problems.

They decided they would count all of those. But guess what they decided they would not count at the outset? They decided they would not count all the ballots that have mutilations or distinguishing marks.

Now under Indiana law there is no problem, apparently, in counting those; those are handled on a case-by-case basis. But they made that kind of across-the-board decision; they would count all the others that had not met the specifics of Indiana law on the way in which they were case, but they would not count those that had the mutilations or the distinguishing marks.

That exception applies to over 24,000 votes in 9 counties. In those counties, the ballots went by more than 1,400 votes for Mr. McIntyre. So one can see just as you work the statistics—and I happen to have some knowledge of the law of probabilities; my wife teaches statistics at the University of Arizona—as you start to play the laws of probability, you are playing a game where you figure out sooner or later your are going to be able to knock off enough votes in that kind of a lead, when you look at those mutilations or distinguishing marks, and you will be able to come out ahead.

Sure enough, they have been able to do it. They have been able to whittle down this lead that ended up at the recount of some 400 votes, by using the House rules, apparently the new election laws of Indiana, or at least the new election laws of the Eighth District of Indiana decided by the House of Representatives task force consisting of two gentlemen from California and one from Missouri who have rewritten the Indiana elections code.

□ 1920

They have written it in such a way and have done everything they could to make sure that the outcome would come out differently, and they still have not been able to get there. They are almost there. It is a dead heat. And maybe on Friday they will be able to figure out some way to make sure that it comes out correctly for them.

One of the ballots that is in dispute, as I understand it—and I do not know that the task force has made a decision on this, but I think it is interesting, the kind of degree to which they are going to go, to which they are going to reach to try to make sure the outcome is the way they want it—in one of the counties of Indiana's Eighth District that is split between the Eighth and the Ninth Districts there is a precinct, I do not know whether it is right on the border or the boundary, but, anyhow, it is one of those counties that is split between two congressional districts, one individual in this country got a ballot, who is in the Eighth District, got a ballot that was from the Ninth District, ended up voting the Ninth District ballot, he was in a precinct that should have had an Eighth District ballot, he voted a straight—he or she, you never know about those things—voted a straight Democratic ticket. Well, the task force, the counters, looked at that, and apparently one of the arguments that is being made by certain staff members of the task force is that, well, clearly, he had intended to vote for Mr. McCloskey because he voted a straight Democratic ticket, and if he had just the opportunity to get the right ballot, he would have done so. Of course the name was not on there. He voted instead, under the law, under the ballot he got, for Mr. Hamilton, but we are going to say he really intended to vote for Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Let us understand this, We have a ballot where someone voted for Mr. Hamilton—

Mr. KOLBE. And it is going to be counted for Mr. McCloskey, that is correct.

Mr. WALKER. And it is going to be counted for Mr. McCloskey?

Mr. KOLBE. I am not sure that the task force has made a final decision on that, but that is one of the arguments, that is one of the ballots that is being considered.

Mr. WALKER. Someone is seriously contending that a ballot cast for Mr. Hamilton in a totally different district is now going to be counted for Mr. McCloskey in order to help Mr. McCloskey's vote?

Mr. KOLBE. Well, the theory is, you see, that if he had just gotten—if they had not made this error and given him the wrong ballot, he really would have voted for Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. WALKER. But effectively he voted for Mr. Hamilton, and now we are going to count it for Mr. McCloskey?

Mr. KOLBE. Absolutely.

Mr. WALKER. And that is evidently what we mean by counting all of the ballots.

Mr. KOLBE. That is what we mean by counting all of the ballots. We might go out onto the street and find some people who did not get a chance to vote and have an opportunity to ask them.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am from the Sixth District of Indiana. Does the gentleman think it is possible we could get the recount commissioner to take 10 or 12 of my ballots down to the Eighth District for Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. KOLBE. I would be happy to contribute a few of mine from Arizona.

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to contribute a few of mine. We could put together quite a package here this evening if that is the way we are going to count around here. That is an interesting new rule that we have written here in the House, that ballots cast for one Member of Congress you can simply transfer over and have them counted for another contested race.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. California has been so diabolically chopped and carved up that our average win, Republicans and Democrats, our average percentile was a 68 percent victory in all 45 seats. We have so many votes to spare in both parties that we should be allowed to transport just thousands of votes to the Eighth District of Indiana.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the offer of the gentleman from California, and I am sure Mr. McIntyre would, as well.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I come from Indiana, and I know of our elective processes there and I know the officials who judged this race, I know our secretary of state, who is a very honorable man, and we kid around about this right now because it is so appalling what is taking place at the hands of the Democrats in taking away this seat from a Republican Congressman—and I call him a Congressman because I think he is and should be—and it is really unfortunate that the elective process in Indiana is being subverted by the Democrats and a precedent is being set that is going to follow elections of this kind probably for the next 20 or 30 years, and I am hopeful that the people of this country realize what is happening right now. A sovereign State is having its election laws overturned and the Congress of the United States, a Democrat

majority, is using a ruse to seat one of its own Members.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Indiana, is it not true, though, that the local Democrats, the Democrats from Indiana, in their count, have said that McIntyre was the winner, but it is the Democrats from the House of Representatives who are doing it otherwise?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield for an answer, yes, you are absolutely correct. Sixty percent of the recount commissioners were Democrats. In nine of the counties, the majority of the counties, the recount commissioners were a majority Democrat, and when they threw out the votes, the ballots that were not correct, which gave Mr. McIntyre a 418 win, 93 percent of those ballots thrown out were thrown out by Democrats, and they said Mr. McIntyre was the legitimate winner by I think 418 votes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for her comments, and the gentleman from Indiana as well.

I think it is useful just to go through once again here and summarize some of the points that need to be made about the race in the Eighth District of Indiana. I think again that it is appropriate that we do so now because we are reaching that final stage, that stage where a final decision is going to have to be made by the task force, following that by the Administration Committee, and following that by this body. I think as each of us looks at the record that we will come to a very clear conclusion about the way that this affair has been handled.

Let us take a look at a few of the points, the facts. First of all, I think that we can conclude that this task force recount probably never should have taken place. No one has ever suggested there was any fraud or there was any irregularity or that anything was handled improperly at the time of the November elections. To this day the opponent has not filed any charge under the Federal elections law with the courts, has not suggested that there was any irregularity in the way that the election was handled. And the vote on election night and the vote at the time the recount was undertaken, that the retallying was undertaken and that the certificate was issued, clearly showed Mr. McIntyre the winner. The vote at the end of the recount clearly showed him the winner. There was no reason that this House of Representatives ever needed to undertake its own recount, to substitute its own will for the people of Indiana

with regard to how elections should be conducted.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. The gentleman has emphasized that there have been no charges of any fraud, et cetera.

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I want to point out that 6 weeks ago the other party singled me out for a vicious attack, suggesting that I had voted to seat Mr. McIntyre for base motives of racial bias.

I spoke on this floor when a press release was circulated to that effect sent out to all of the media in my district.

I pointed out that this was the standard tactic for people who have need to attempt to steal a congressional seat.

Now, certain facts deserve to be repeated on the eve of the completion of that would-be theft. The loser of that race—and pray to God that he will not be named the winner by his friends—never entered an election contest and never until after this matter got to this body alleged any vote irregularity of any kind.

There was a time limit, as you know, after the election to do that. The reason is quite simple. All the irregularities that he alleged had benefited him. Neither I nor anyone who voted to seat the real winner, the one who was certified by the State, voted to disenfranchise anyone, nor did I vote to deny anyone's voting rights. The Federal court in Indiana never even mentioned such an issue.

What is crystal clear is that the only thing of importance to those who smeared my reputation was to get the seat for the loser. Facts were not important then and they are not important now.

We can be sure that the task force will attempt to baptize a new winner in Indiana's eighth. Then if they do that, I am going to ask: Who will have violated the voting rights of the citizens of that district?

And I think this is a course we must pursue.

I thank the gentleman.

□ 1930

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for her comments and I was not aware that you had been subject to that kind of attack in your congressional district. I think it is most reprehensible and unfortunate that people, certain individuals feel a need to indulge in that kind of attack on others on the basis of a vote that they cast.

In my view I do not suggest any motives, racial motives on the part of anybody in the votes that they cast on this floor. My view is very clear on this issue. I think they are wrong-headed about the votes that they are casting.

I think they are doing so for a partisan, political reason, but not for any other kind of reason. Not for anything that has been suggested in your case.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COBEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I think it is fitting that I should be here on the eve of the conclusion of this recount and the gentleman from Maryland. We all are freshman Congressmen; we all were in close races and this could easily be us involved in a situation like the Indiana eighth just as Rick McIntyre is involved.

There were a lot of close races this year. We were all sworn in on January the 3d except Rick McIntyre. I just have never understood why the House of Representatives Task Force had to go out and conduct this recount. We have already had a count of the votes; a 34-vote victory for Rick McIntyre. He was certified by the Secretary of the State of Indiana just like I was certified by the Secretary of North Carolina. Then there was a recount; he won by 418 votes. We have heard already that nine of these counties were controlled by Democratic boards, and why have we gone through this count?

Yes; I stand behind the House of Representatives' right to go in and investigate this race, but why did we not have an investigation and a determination as to whether a recount or not was needed? There was no alleged irregularities, and yet we have been subjected to this count.

Mr. KOLBE. I would just like to respond, and I will yield further to the gentleman from North Carolina. I think the question is a good one and one that needs to be raised now and on each appropriate opportunity on this floor as to why this is being done. I think the answer is fairly clear. We are going to recount as often as we must; we are going to change the rules in such a way, as often as we must, in order to get the outcome to come out the way that certain individuals, a certain group, the majority in this body, clearly want it to come.

You were not here at the beginning of my remarks, but considering your background I think you would appreciate this particular analogy. I made the analogy of this election to the 1972 Olympic basketball championship, where if you will recall the United States and the Soviet Union fought down to the wire at the end of the time, the United States won by one point.

The East European referee rolled back the clock for 3 seconds; they played the last 3 seconds; they still did not score a basket, so they rolled back the clock again for another 3 seconds.



Sure enough, on the third try, they got a basket in.

The point is, if you play it often enough, the game, the law of statistics says that you will get the team you want to be the winner, and sure enough, if you recount this election often enough, especially if you change the rules as they did in this case, you might as well have taken four of our five basketball team members off the court, if they change the rules enough, sure you can get it so it comes out the way you want it, that is exactly what happened in this case.

I yield further.

Mr. COBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think we need to continue to reiterate the point, the fact that he was the certified winner by the Secretary of State. I am glad the Governor of Indiana is pursuing this case in the courts on behalf of the people of Indiana. I hope no matter what the outcome is that this case is continued to be pursued in the courts because we are breaking with precedents, 200 years of precedents. This would be a horrible thing to establish that this House of Representatives, after 200 years of always seating the certified candidate or certified winner of a race, to suddenly break with that tradition in an unconstitutional manner and establish a new precedent.

We have to establish that in law that this is wrong and not a right action on the part of the majority party. While we have been going through all these recounts, and I know we are told it will be over tomorrow and that we will consider this matter next week, but we have been promised week after week that this was going to be over. We are now at the 105th day that the people of the 8th District of Indiana have not been represented in this body. They do not have anybody here to vote on critical issues, but they are being taxed; they paid their taxes on April 15. This is the very thing that our Revolutionary War was fought over, the fact that we were taxed without representation.

So we need to get this over with quickly, but we cannot allow this to be forgotten, because we cannot allow this to be repeated again.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and I think you have made two or three points that I would like to emphasize. Certainly that last one I think needs to be emphasized and that is that we should not forget this case. Unfortunately, certainly for a long time to come, we will not be able to forget it because I think it has left an indelible scar on the good will which should mark the conduct of this body. I think that perhaps is the most tragic thing about this case. It need never have happened that way.

You also made a point that I think is a good one, earlier, and that is that

there is 200 years of precedent. There are 82 cases that are directly on this point in the way in which the House views an election under these conditions. In each of those cases, in every single one of those cases, the individual that carried the certificate was seated on the floor of the House of Representatives. I say that, make that statement with the full knowledge of the Rouse-Chambers case in Indiana 25 years ago, where the individual who came with, there were two individuals, each with a certificate, one from the Governor, a dispute over that. In that case, no one was seated, but there was not a clear indication of who had the legitimate certificate. So I think it is absolutely accurate to say in every single case that the individual who has won an election, has brought the certificate and has come to this body with that certificate, that individual has been seated.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think we do need to make the point that on several occasions we have heard the Democrats parade out onto the floor a series of precedent cases that they said are precedents that say that what the gentleman has just stated would be absolutely wrong, that they have got all kinds of precedents of people who were not seated.

The point being that every one of those previous cases involved fraud of some kind. No one, no one, has said that there is fraud involved in this election. If they have got proof that there is fraud involved in this election, they should have brought it out a long time ago. The fact is that they do not have anything of that kind. So those precedents are meaningless. The only precedent that they have that has any smidgeon of a precedent is the Rouse-Chambers case, which the gentleman just discussed, and the Rouse-Chambers case, as the gentleman said, you had two certificates that were involved.

So it is a totally absurd precedent for this case too. But to have them come to the floor from time to time and try to mislead the American people on the basis that this is not the only case, that there have been previous cases before, that fact is that when you look back at all those precedents they have cited, there is fraud involved, that somebody came to Congress, for instance, carrying a fraudulent certificate. Well, obviously we are not going to seat someone who has a fraudulent certificate; maybe one he printed up in his own basement. That is obviously not a case where we are going to seat someone.

But those are not precedent cases for what is happening in Indiana, this is a case of just raw power of the majority, a dictatorship of the majority

denying the seat to a certificated Member of Congress from his home State.

□ 1940

This is the first time in history that that has ever happened, the first time in history that the House has abrogated to itself the authority to deny a certificated Member from a State his rightful seat in this body. It is one of the most horrendous examples of this House exercising its dictatorial power rather than being a democratic body that it was intended to be under our Constitution.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and you have hit on a point that I think is very important. There is a very clear reason why so many of us in this body are very concerned about the precedent that is being established in this case. It is not simply the issue of Mr. McIntyre versus Mr. McCloskey or 1 out of 435 races in congressional districts in the United States, as important that it is.

It is the question of the abuse of power by the majority, the abuse of power which would allow that party to say, "Although there is no precedent for doing so, we will not seat an individual who carries a certificate of election," an abuse of power that makes each of us, I think, certainly those of us in the minority, and in my opinion it ought to apply just as well to those in the majority, be concerned with the fact that one party, one group, can abuse its power in such a way as to deny a seat to an individual who wins an election and is certified and comes to this body to be seated.

We should be concerned about that. All of us who believe in the rights of the minority, all of us who believe in the democratic process in this country, should be very concerned that that can take place. If today it is Mr. McIntyre, tomorrow who will it be? Which Member of this body will be the next target in the next election?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have missed part of the debate this evening, so excuse me if I cover old ground, but it is my understanding that the latest count that we have is that Mr. McCloskey is ahead by 1 vote. I guess we all come to this body as U.S. Representatives and we obviously want to uphold the Constitution, and nobody questions the fact that the House is going to be the sole judge of who it shall seat, but I think there are some very legitimate questions that can be raised about the validity of this latest recount.

No. 1, insofar as I can tell from research, the counting rules used in the

recount have never been used in any election before. They did not use the State election code of Indiana nor any other State or Federal election code. They basically, on a 2-to-1 vote, decided to count every conceivable ballot that could be called a ballot except those that had distinguishing marks.

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. You mentioned the basketball scenario. To me, that is a scenario where the leaders in the majority party have decided that the only chance they have to win, they could not win the original election, which Mr. McIntyre won by 34 votes, they could not win under the election code of Indiana, which Mr. McIntyre won by 418 votes, the only possible chance they had to win was to come up with a set of rules that had never been used before, and using their own set of rules, they have now managed to strain mightily and possibly eke out a one-vote victory.

If I were an American citizen who was not a Member of this body, I would have some real questions about the validity of seating a Member of the U.S. Congress using recount rules that had never been used before, that had not ballot security provisions. As I understand it, even in this recount, Mr. McIntyre at one point had a one- or two-vote victory and they went back into another county and disqualified one or two votes that had been given to Mr. McIntyre. "So we are going to play until we win, and we will change the rules in the middle of the game if we need to, or at the end of the game, or we will start a whole new ball game."

I just have some real personal concerns about the mentality that can justify that type of a procedure. Of course, the procedure was agreed to in the task force by a 2-to-1 vote, the majority voted for it and the minority member voted against it, but I just have a real concern about that and I am at a loss to determine what to do to rectify that.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KOLBE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and when he finishes I would like to pursue this matter of the counting rules because they are very interesting, the rules that were adopted.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield, I just wanted to tell the gentleman from Texas, he was not on the floor when we had a discussion here a little while ago, we think there is a possibility, the gentleman will be pleased to know this, knowing of his concern, we think there is a possibility that the one vote we are now referring to was not a vote cast for Mr. McCloskey but was a vote cast for Mr. HAMILTON, but what they have now done, according to the gentleman from Arizona, is that they have now taken this

ballot—and there is a possibility of this, so we are not certain—at least a recommendation was made that this ballot be counted, that they have taken a ballot that was cast in another congressional district for Mr. HAMILTON and decided that that was really a ballot that they meant to cast for Mr. McCloskey, and that that, in fact, has become a vote in the process.

The gentleman must find, as we did, it absolutely amazing that we have now developed counting rules in the House of Representatives that take a ballot cast for one Member of Congress and transfer it over and have it counted for another Member of Congress in a totally different district. You have to be really fascinated by counting rules that have gotten us to this point that the Democrats put in place by a 2-to-1 vote.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, is it also a fact, or at least it is my understanding, that there are now more votes in some of the counties than there are registered voters, or than voters that signed the poll list?

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct. That is correct. They decided to count all the ghost voters where the number of votes exceed the number of people that signed the vote register. It is possible one can make an argument that somebody did not sign the register and there were 40 people who signed the register but 41 people came in to vote and one failed to sign. So they have made a decision to count all of those ballots.

What is interesting is the ones they have decided not to count.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, what we are saying is we now have also more ballots counted than we had voters in the district in some of these places under the counting rules we have adopted?

Mr. KOLBE. As I understand it, it is not more than voters, but more than voters who signed the register as having voted on that day. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. But the reason why they signed the register is to make certain that that person was actually there to cast that vote. Is that not right? That is a fraud protection.

Mr. KOLBE. That is a fraud protection and there are more ballots cast than there are signatures.

Mr. WALKER. And we now have, under the counting procedures that we adopted in the House, a system that allows more ballots to be counted than people signed up who came to the polls that day?

Mr. KOLBE. That is, as I understand it, correct.

Mr. WALKER. And we are also counting ballots from totally different congressional districts in this process.

Mr. KOLBE. Yes; the ballot clearly is not from the Eighth Congressional District. It apparently was cast inside the Eighth District but it was a ballot from the Ninth District.

Mr. WALKER. Those sure are interesting rules. When we really count all the ballots around here, we really count all the ballots, do we not?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have but one question, and that is, you alluded not so much to the ballots that they added that should not have been counted, but some that they disallowed. I am kind of curious about those.

What ballots did they not allow? It sounded earlier like they counted everything and more, and now you are telling us that they disallowed some ballots, and I would like to know what those were and under what conditions they disallowed them.

Mr. KOLBE. There were some very large exceptions to the ballots that were not counted.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No doubt those would have favored Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct. Those were in the counties where there was a 1,400-vote margin for Mr. McIntyre, and as I said earlier, if you play the law of statistics, eventually you are going to come out with your side winning.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, I just want to follow up here.

Did we have any of these counties where they counted more people or any of these precincts where they counted more people than there were actual people who signed up and came to the polls? Were any of those Mr. McIntyre's areas?

Mr. KOLBE. There is no evidence yet that the dairy cows and hogs have yet been counted, but we clearly have more votes being counted than people signed the register on that election day.

Mr. WALKER. But did those tend to be in Mr. McCloskey's areas where we are counting more people than there were actually people signed up?

Mr. KOLBE. I honestly do not know the answer to that.

Mr. WALKER. But what we do know is where they threw out ballots and said that these were not going to be counted, those just happened to be in Mr. McIntyre's areas?

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. That is an interesting process.

Mr. KOLBE. Here are the rules adopted by the task force on the Eighth District for counting. Here are some of the rules for the ballots that they will count.



Rule No. 1. Count an otherwise valid paper (regular) ballot that was not initialed by the poll clerks.

□ 1950

Indiana law says it has to be initialed to be a valid vote, but they will count those.

No. 2. "Count an otherwise valid paper absentee ballot not properly initialed by poll clerks." So they will count that.

"3. Count an otherwise valid punch-card (regular) ballot not properly initialed by poll clerks." So they will count those even though the Indiana law says that should not be counted.

"4. Count an otherwise valid punch-card absentee ballot not properly initialed by poll clerks." So they are going to count these.

"5. Count an otherwise valid paper ballot without precinct designation." That also, under the Indiana law, has to be included on there.

"6. Count an otherwise valid punch-card ballot without precinct designation," and so on, and so on.

Now, let us get on to what they decided they would not count.

No. 12: "Distinguishing marks on paper ballot.

"Do not count a ballot which contains any distinguishing marks.

"A distinguishing mark is any marking on the ballot (such as a name, initial, erasure, number, or special symbol), other than the intended voting mark which appears to have been placed there by the voter in order to identify that ballot as the one cast by that particular voter.

"A distinguishing mark is something done to the ballot by the voter for the purpose of indicating who cast it, thereby evading the law insuring the secrecy of the vote."

So if you put your initial on it, you do not get counted. On the other hand, if the poll worker did not put his initials on it, it does get counted. I am seeing a little inconsistency here.

I go on with a reading of the particular rule that the task force came up with:

"A distinguishing mark must change the condition of the ballot, in a manner other than allowed by law, from its condition when the ballot was handed to the voter."

But apparently, concluding it from that particular rule there, you do count a ballot that was not marked as the law in Indiana said that it had to be marked by the poll clerk, properly initialed by the poll clerk, with the proper precinct designation on it.

It is a very interesting set of rules they came up with to count these ballots. I think it is very interesting that in the process, with the statistical numbers working in their favor, they still at the end of the day are in a dead heat, with one vote separating the two of them. One would think, with all

this talent working out there, they certainly would have been able to get a few dozen votes for their candidate to win by.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is kind of interesting to me that this procedure is taking place at all. There were no allegations of fraud. Mr. McIntyre won the first count, the original count, by 30-some votes. The recount was taking place under the laws of the State of Indiana that we have had for some time, and the majority of the recount commissioners were of the opposite party, Democrats. They threw out most of the votes that were disallowed in those counties. I think 93 percent of the votes that were thrown out were thrown out by Democrat recount commissioners, and after all that, Mr. McIntyre won by 418 votes. Yet they have gone through this procedure. It is just unbelievable.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, and I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has expired.

#### THE COMMUNIST MILITARY BUILDUP IN CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we will take the whole 60 minutes, but I would like to discuss a little bit more in depth the problems in Central America.

Last week I was down in Central America. I flew into Guatemala City on Easter Sunday. Then 2 days later we went into El Salvador, and subsequently we went into Nicaragua.

One of the things that was most intriguing to me was, when I went into El Salvador and took a helicopter out in Chalatenango Province, I met with a Colonel Acholla, and Colonel Acholla showed us a recently captured cache of Communist weapons that was sent to that country obviously from the Communist bloc.

Many of my colleagues in the House have indicated that there is no evidence that the Communist Sandinista government in Nicaragua is exporting revolution to El Salvador and elsewhere into Central America. I saw with my own eyes Communist weapons in El Salvador, and I would like to tell the Members what those weapons are doing. They are trying to undermine the duly elected Government of El Salvador.

I went into a little village in Chalatenango Province, and a lady came out

to visit us, a little lady whose husband had been maimed about 3 weeks or 4 weeks before that. Her husband ran a little jitney service in between two towns. They do not have a whole lot of bus service down there because the economy does not warrant it or will not support a bus line, and this little jitney service he ran consisted of one small used truck, and into that truck he would put as many people as he could possibly put to transfer back and forth.

The day before the Salvadoran elections, Mr. Speaker, he had 18 people in that truck, and in between two of those towns a manually operated landmine was detonated under that truck. It was a Communist landmine supplied through Nicaragua or Cuba because it could not have just grown out of the ground. When that landmine detonated, it destroyed that truck, and along with it, it killed 7 people, 2 of them babies, and injured 11 more, including the driver, the husband of this lady who talked to us.

We asked her about that, and she said it was the Communist guerrillas being supplied by either Cuba or Nicaragua with Soviet-bloc military supplies.

We talked with the leaders of that country, and we then went into El Salvador, Mr. Speaker. We went to Managua, and I was very appalled at what I saw there. We went into the hotel in Managua, the biggest hotel in that city, and immediately after walking through that lobby, we found nothing in that lobby of a literary nature except the works of Karl Marx, Communist dogma. That is all they had in the lobby, at the bookstand, or in the cigarette area where they sell cigarettes, candy, and so forth.

In that lobby were Internationalists, Communist sympathizers who have come from the United States and around the world to support the Communist Sandinista government.

We met during that trip with educators, with priests, with nuns, with business leaders, and with members of the Government and former members of the Government, and with the exception of the leaders of the Communist Nicaraguan Government, every single person with whom I talked said that if aid to the Contras, the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, is cut off, the Communists will solidify their position, the repressions will increase, and they will be exporting revolution throughout Central America.

That borders upon endangering the security of the United States of America. If that revolution expands beyond the borders of Nicaragua, we all know there will be literally millions of refugees fleeing Central America and coming through Mexico and into Texas and the United States. This will

result in hardship on the American economy.

Can we imagine what it would be like, Mr. Speaker, if we had 10 million to 20 million refugees in this country, trying to house them, feed them, educate them, and clothe them? And, of course, they will be wanting jobs, and they will be willing to work for \$1 or \$2 or \$3 an hour, much less than what Americans are being paid. And that, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, will lead to massive unemployment, unemployment of Americans, and it is not necessary.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not true that after all of the Indochina refugees have come to this country—and we all know that because the left failed us in Southeast Asia and, therefore, created a situation that resulted in a massive refugee migration into this country from there—all told, that has equaled about 500,000 people who have come to this country as a result of that migration?

And is it not true that we already have about 590,000 people who have come out of the situation in Central America as a result of the Communist guerrillas' activities in El Salvador, as a result of what is happening in Nicaragua, and that we already have a migration into this country from Central America greater than all that that has taken place so far from Indochina?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes, I believe the gentleman is accurate. And in addition to that, there has been a migration of people out of the Communist Nicaraguan area into Costa Rica. They believe they have between 20,000 and 100,000 there. They are not sure exactly how many because they cannot keep track of them, but they know they have at least 20,000 in Costa Rica.

They have refugees in Honduras, in Guatemala, and in El Salvador trying to flee the repression that has been created in Communist Nicaragua.

□ 2000

If that revolution is exported, as Thomas Borja and Daniel Ortega and Umberto Ortega have said that it is going to be, if that spreads throughout Central America they will have no place to go but to the United States of America.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it is important to note that the Indochina refugees who were here are here legally. They have been legally admitted so that we have brought them in through the regular processes of the country, which means that we have

processed them in through our economy.

The 590,000 I am referring to, which I believe is an accurate figure, are here illegally, which means that they represent a major problem to this country, as the gentleman has pointed out, economically and also represent a major problem to the entire immigration process, the legal process that we have in this country, so that the threat the gentleman refers to later on is indeed a very powerful threat, because we are already seeing elements of it happening and it could become an even more intense problem if as the gentleman points out the Nicaraguan Communists begin to spread their revolution throughout Central America.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, that is absolutely correct. The problem is much greater than that. Those people do not want to come to the United States of America. They want to stay in their homeland. That is where they were born. That is where they were raised. That is where their roots are.

But in addition to that, the United States of America, in my opinion, will not be able to stand idly by and let all this occur. At some point we are going to have to protect our southern border. We have 1,980 miles of border between the United States and Mexico. I call it the soft underbelly of America. We cannot leave that exposed to communism. At some point we are going to have to provide a defense perimeter someplace either down in Mexico or south of Mexico to protect our southern flank. That is going to cost not \$14 million, which is what the Contras want right now to protect themselves and to protect freedoms and get their country back, which has been kidnaped by the Communists, but it will cost us much, much more. It will cost us billions of dollars and American lives as well, because we will have to provide manpower to protect our southern flank.

Now, people say in this body that that is not likely to occur, but these people down there really do not want to export that revolution. Thomas Borja in numerous speeches has said they want a revolution without borders. In a 1983 Playboy interview when he was asked a question about Jean Kirkpatrick when he said that the Communist Sandinista government wants to expand their revolution into El Salvador, then Guatemala, or Honduras and then into Guatemala, and ultimately into Mexico, he said that is one prophecy. Mr. Borja said, that is one prophecy of Ronald Reagan's that is absolutely correct.

Now, many of my colleagues say, we will just wait them out. That revolution cannot last. We said that about Cuba 25 years ago and now it is a bastion of Soviet and Communist strength in the Caribbean. They have

Mig-23 fighter bombers. When John F. Kennedy was President he imposed what was called the Kennedy Doctrine. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, he turned the Soviet ships around and sent them back when they were bringing missiles to Cuba during the Cuban missile crisis. He not only sent those missiles back, but he demanded that Soviet troops be taken out of Cuba and all offensive weapons and there would be no Communist expansionism into our hemisphere beyond Cuba.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Cuba has Mig-23 fighter bombers. They have thousands of Soviet troops down there, 9,000 to be exact, and they are an armed camp. So anybody who believes that the menace will go away simply because we are going to outwait them is sorely mistaken.

I want to cite as an example one of the things that they are teaching their children in school to perpetuate the revolution beyond just this generation. I received while I was in Managua, Nicaragua, last week a copy of a school text. I wish everybody in America could see this. This text is on mathematics, mathematics. On about the second, third, or fourth page, it shows them how to add, three machineguns plus three machineguns equals six machineguns. Two handgrenades plus two handgrenades equals six handgrenades. They are indoctrinating the youth of that country just like they are in Cuba with a revolutionary philosophy.

The storybook problems in this mathematics text also talk about the revolution.

I also received an English book for the first, second, third, and fourth graders. In that all they talk about is the revolution, the Communist revolution and how they must support it. They are indoctrinating these young people so that they will be militarists throughout their lifetimes, but they are still having trouble getting young people to join the military.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side say that the Contras, the freedom fighters, are repressive, that they are perpetrating atrocities on the people of Nicaragua. The fact of the matter is they are not kidnaping people to come into their army. The people are going to them and joining voluntarily because they are tired of the repression that is being perpetrated upon them by the Communists; but just the opposite is true as far as the Communist military is concerned in Nicaragua. It is not uncommon to see them going down the streets and chasing a young 13-, 14-, or 15-year-old person and forcing them into a truck and forcing them into the military.

They are trying to get an additional 30,000 young people into the military this year, even though they already have an armed militia, an army total-



ing 120,000 people, which is twice what all the other countries of Central America combined have.

Mr. Speaker, this is really intolerable. They are telling us exactly what they plan to do and we are not doing anything about it.

While I was down there, I found out that they had just arrested five mothers, the Communist Sandinista government had arrested five mothers and put them in prison because they were trying to keep their little kids from being inducted into the military, forced into the Communist Sandinista army. They had a bunch of mothers whose boys had been forced into the Communist Sandinista army, 700 of them in fact, that were in Managua and a bunch of mothers came to see their boys. Hundreds of mothers came to see their children and they would not let them see them. The mothers pushed against the gates so hard that the gate gave way and the guards that were guarding that gate were supposed to stop the mothers from getting in and they had orders to stop them in any way they could.

The 700 boys left. The mothers left and the guards left with them because they did not have the heart to shoot them and they knew that there would be reprisals because they did not stop those mothers from getting in there. That is the kind of government that is being perpetrated upon those people, forced upon those people in Nicaragua right now.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much more that is going to come out during this debate. I just hope the American people have the opportunity to hear all of it. The repression is great.

The Catholic priests, the 10 Catholic priests that were forced out of the country, one Catholic priest because he would not adopt the Communist line in his homilies was forced to walk down the streets of his parish naked before his parishioners to embarrass him. That is unbelievable.

The Pope when he went there, they would not let the people come out to see him. Every country where the Pope went—I am not Catholic, but I believe in religious freedom—every country where the Pope appeared, there were thousands and thousands of people along the streets to cheer him, but when he went into Managua, I have a tape from down there, a movie tape, which shows that they kept the people back from the streets from seeing the Pope.

When he went to give his homily in the square, they had Sandinista troops ringing the square. When the Pope started to speak, they interrupted the speech. They took control of the microphones. They had microphones underneath the stand and they started screaming Soviet Communist slogans into those microphones, drowning out the Pope.

This is all documented. The religious persecution that has been taking place is unbelievable. I talked to one of the leaders of the 950 Catholic priests and nun organization down there, and he said that the repression is unbelievable.

I asked him as well as I asked everybody else, what will happen if there is no organized resistance to the Communist government in this country?

He said, along with everyone I talked to, the repression will increase. The censorship will increase and many people are going to lose their lives.

The Communists will consolidate their position within that country and the revolution will be exported into El Salvador, into Honduras, into Guatemala, and ultimately into Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, nothing has been more clear to me since I came to the Congress of the United States and I believe that most of my colleagues who have been down there share my view. I think a blind person could go down there and see what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, next week on Tuesday we are going to cast one of the most important votes this Congress will ever cast in our lifetimes. If we do not vote to support the freedom fighters who are fighting for their liberties and their freedoms, who are fighting to get their country back, we are going to make a terrible, terrible mistake, that is going to be carried on by the future generations of America.

I have a 10-year-old son, Danny Lee Burton II. I want that boy to have the very best, everything that we have been able to have in America. I certainly do not want him to go to fight in an unnecessary war in some place that I do not want him to be; but, Mr. Speaker, I truly believe in my heart of hearts that if we do not allow the people of Nicaragua to regain control of their country, if we do not allow the freedom fighters the ability to fight for their own country, that at some point in the future, in the not too distant future, we will have American boys down in Central America fighting unnecessarily. God forbid that my boy will be one of them.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because he made a point here a minute ago that I think is an important point.

A lot of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, some of our liberal friends, have been down in Nicaragua recently. They have come back and they would not necessarily share the gentleman's viewpoint. What they had to say is somewhat different from what the gentleman has said; but almost invariably now when they are coming to the floor they are saying

things like, "Well, I'm not for the Sandinistas. I think what they are doing down there is very bad, that there is indeed repression there."

So to confirm what the gentleman just said, nearly everybody who goes down there does see very clearly what is going on and nearly everybody, even though they do not share his and my viewpoint about the situation, will say that the Sandinistas are pretty bad, that what we are doing is pretty bad down there.

□ 2010

And one of the things that I think is important to understand is that if you really think that, and if you really went to Nicaragua and saw it, and I have not been there, but the gentleman I think has given us a very clear report of what he saw, but if, as some of our liberal friends are saying, that they have been there and they have seen how bad it is, we need to understand the context in which we will be voting on this matter next week.

There is a pro-Sandinista vote and an anti-Sandinista vote that is going to be cast here. There is a pro-Communist vote and an anti-Communist vote as it relates to the situation in Nicaragua that is going to be cast here. That is the context in which we are going to be voting and if in fact what the Sandinista Communists are doing in Nicaragua is as horrible as virtually everybody coming back reports, I do not understand how anyone could cast a vote that will give aid and comfort to that government. It is very difficult for me to understand how anybody understanding what they are doing to their own people, and what kind of a Communist dictatorship they are installing in Nicaragua, how anyone understanding that could cast a vote that will give aid and comfort to that government is beyond me.

So I think what the gentleman has said here this evening is extremely important because he has made every cogent point based upon his own experience, but I think has reflected very clearly that many of our colleagues who do not necessarily share his viewpoint are also telling us something very important in a totally different way when they come out here and admit that they do not think the Sandinistas are a very good government for the Nicaraguan people. What they ought to do is take that one step further and say that no one ought to be voting for something that will give them the kind of support that they are looking for in the U.S. Congress.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would just like to end up by saying that Daniel Ortega in an interview with JIM SENSENBRENNER of this body, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr.

SENSENBRENNER] and another individual who went with me to Central America, said, when asked about a revolution without borders, that that was what he had said in the past, and a revolution without borders means a revolution that encompasses all of Central America.

The security of the United States of America will undoubtedly be threatened if this prophecy of Mr. Ortega comes true, and we will be involved in a military conflict that is unnecessary. And if the future generations of this country will be threatened, their security will be threatened, and their freedom will be threatened.

You know for over 200 years we have always had a strong defense, we have always had a policy of defending our hemisphere. We had the Kennedy Doctrine and we had the Monroe Doctrine, and those doctrines have gone out the window. And I sincerely hope and pray that my colleagues, before next Tuesday, will see the light so that the kids of today will not have to be the soldiers of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD NICARAGUA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the vote coming up on Tuesday next is not only crucial to the future of this country, as we have heard here so eloquently stated just a moment ago by my colleague from Indiana, but it is crucial to the Democratic Party. It is a major test of the stated aims of the Democratic Party to move back into the center, to move back into the mainstream of American politics. It gives the Democratic Party a chance for the first time in national policy since the nomination of George McGovern, a chance to throw off those chains which have grown stronger and stronger since that election debacle in 1972.

We have heard a lot about moving back to the center from leading Democrats. Particularly we have heard a lot from Democratic Governors in the South, in the Southwest, and in the West. These are regional politicians who are listening closely to the voices of their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to my colleagues, to the American people, a series of arguments as to what indeed the main criticisms of our policy in Nicaragua are, and to provide a counter to those criticisms which I believe should and can be embraced by center leaning moderate Democrats in this body.

It has been very fashionable, perhaps even obligatory for the critics of

the administration's Nicaraguan policy to proffer certain statements as if they were axiomatic to the truth, and this is being done in the face of overwhelming historical, intellectual and yes, even moral evidence to the contrary. And when not excusing they seem intent on rationalizing the behavior of the Sandinistas.

I would like to provide some examples. There is the criticism that the Sandinistas are not Communists. Critics argue that the regime is not Communist totalitarian, and they point to a token newspaper that is allowed to continue to publish, albeit in the face of massive censorship. They point to an existence of a continuing repressed, indeed, small business community. They point to some unions and some independent agriculture. They underline continuing political opposition, although that opposition, as evidenced by the recent election, has now mobilized itself against the Sandinista regime and joined, for all intents and purposes, with the Contras.

They talk about visits of church and other groups invited to see for themselves in Nicaragua as evidence that this is not a Communist totalitarian regime. What is missed, what is completely missed is the game that is being played by the Sandinista Communists with world opinion and with U.S. opinion.

By keeping alive a token press, a token small business, a token labor union, a token political opposition, the Sandinista Communists win points within world and U.S. opinion that prevents them from losing foreign credits, that prevents them from losing whatever trade they have retained. It also confuses world opinion and deters any cohesive diplomatic or military action against it.

Like all Communist rhetoric, the Sandinista Communist rhetoric has clearly spelled out the goals. Yet many people and organizations refuse to take this rhetoric at face value.

Let me just quote somewhat from a selection of statements defining the nature of the Sandinistas.

□ 2020

In a speech before the Sandinista armed forces, Humberto Ortega, the Sandinista Minister of Defense, is quoted as saying:

Marxism-Leninism is the scientific doctrine that guides our revolution, the instrument of analysis of our vanguard to understand the historical process and to create revolution. Marxism-Leninism and Sandinismo are indissolubly united and because of that our moral strength is Sandinismo and our doctrine is that of Marxism-Leninism.

Hugo Torres, a member of the general staff of the Sandinista Popular Army, on April 23, 1982, is quoted as saying:

The principles of Marxism-Leninism wisely applied to the reality of our society

guided the revolutionary actions of the FSLN over the dictatorship.

Victor Tirado Lopez is quoted by Jeane Kirkpatrick in a Reader's Digest article of July 1983, stating "that Marxism-Leninism is a fundamental part of the Sandinista ideology." That is Victor Tirado Lopez, a junta member of the FSLN.

"Ortega will appear to push democracy," that is in reference to President Ortega. "This has fooled some international circles. I do not believe there are divergencies in the national directorate of the Sandinista Party. Some want to go faster, some slower, but the goal is the same, a tropicalized Marxism-Leninist Party." Luis Rivas-Leiva, head of the Social Democratic Party, that is one of the opposition parties, quoted in the Washington Times of February 25, 1985.

"The Sandinistas are determined to impose a controlled system. Their final goal is implantation of a Communist totalitarian regime." Jaime Chamorro, coeditor of La Prensa in the Washington Times, February 25, 1985.

I would like to just present a few elements of the connection with the Soviet military establishment that the Sandinistas enjoy. For one, there are an estimated 10,000 Soviet, Cuban, East German, North Korean, Vietnamese, Czech, Bulgarian, Libyan, and Palestinian forces in Nicaragua. This is what former Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick, calls the Soviet international fighting force.

The Soviet Union recently supplied Nicaragua with 110 medium battle tanks, 30 light amphibious tanks, 200 armored personnel carriers, 70 long-range artillery pieces and nearly 500 rocket launchers, howitzers, and anti-aircraft guns. These are State Department figures quoted in the New York Times of February 9, 1985.

As of February 1985, total equipment, including 200 armored vehicles, 150 tanks, and 44 helicopters, including some 6 to 8 MI-24 Hind Ds helicopters, these are the same infamous weapons that are being used against the Afghani freedom fighters in far away Afghanistan by their Soviet invaders.

The Sandinistas are building the largest airport in Latin America at Punta Huete with Soviet assistance. It will be capable of handling any size Soviet aircraft. (See Washington Post, August 17, 1984.)

I think there is no doubt that the Nicaraguans have received chemical warfare equipment, that is the opinion of Caspar Weinberger, our Secretary of Defense. All of this, of course, comes directly from the Soviet Union.

From 1962 to 1982 the Soviet Union provided \$4 billion in military assistance to Latin America. For the same



period the United States supplied \$1.5 billion.

I think this is an indication that what we are talking about is a Soviet base on the mainland of the Western Hemisphere, a Soviet base on the land bridge between North and South America.

I would like to talk a little bit about the kind of indoctrination techniques that the Sandinista Communists have used quite similar to that which we have seen in Cuba and in other Soviet bloc states.

The Sandinistas have created Cuban and Soviet style mass organizations designed to indoctrinate and control the people at all levels of society. Their organizations have adopted the structures, the rhetoric and methods of their Cuban and Soviet models. One of the most repressive instruments of control is the Sandinista defense committees, [CDS] which are neighborhood committees organized to spy on neighbors.

Tomas Borge, the Minister of Interior, has called the some 10,000 CDS's, the eyes and ears of the revolution. This is taken from "Broken Promises, Sandinista Repression of Human Rights in Nicaragua," State Department document, October 1984.

I would like to talk a little bit about how the Sandinistas have treated the labor movement. Again, quite similar to that of other Communist governments where they have been established.

The AFL-CIO has stated that the Sandinistas have "established a dictatorship that all but destroyed the right to strike, to organize, or to bargain collectively without interference." Taken from the AFL-CIO Free Trade Union News, March 1984.

"Upon coming to power the FSLN immediately began its campaign to destroy the two democratic trade union centers of Nicaragua, the Confederation de Unificacion Sindical [CUS] and the Central de Trabajadores de Nicaragua [CTN]." Taken from AFL-CIO, Free Trade Union News, March 1984.

Within hours of taking control the Sandinista leadership formed the Central Sandinista de Trabajadores [CST], that is the central workers organization, and insisted that all unions should belong to one trade union central.

When the two democratic unions centrals declined, the FSLN embarked on a unification plan that violated every concept of human and trade union rights. Taken again from the AFL-CIO Free Trade Union News, March 1984.

Comparing Nicaragua with Poland one Nicaraguan labor leader said: "We are both small countries and have suffered many invasions. We both experience long lines and scarcity while many of our products are shipped off

to the Soviet bloc. We are Catholic countries with close ties between the unions and the church. We live under regimes where citizens can be jailed at will. And both governments brand independent trade unions, 'anti-socialist agents of imperialism.'" Sam Leiken, Labor Under Siege, the New Republic, October 8, 1984.

I would like to go to my conclusion on this point.

If it looks like a duck, if it walks like a duck, if it quacks like a duck, it must be a duck.

What we are seeing is Nicaraguan communism moving to solidify its gains. Let us call it that. Let us no longer delude ourselves that this is some kind of reform movement in transition. Let us understand the nature of what we are dealing with here.

□ 2030

When it comes to a vote next Tuesday, let the leadership of the Democratic Party in this House know that they will be pulling the rug under opposition forces to this Communist totalitarian movement, to this group of individuals who seeks to establish a Soviet base directly south of the borders of the United States of America.

It is somewhat inconvenient for the Sandinistas to have to put up with a trade union here and a La Prensa newspaper there, and a bishop who doesn't support them. And that slows them down in their transition to a fully totalitarian Communist state.

Let us look at what really slows them down: What is really slowing down this transition is the rebellion of the Nicaraguan people who dislike what they perceive as this inexorable movement to totalitarian Communist government.

That slowing down, that prevention of the solidification of Marxist-Leninist rule, that is the essential achievement of the Contra war against the Sandinistas. The Sandinistas feel obliged to show the world they are really not what they are. So that the world will not support the cause of the Contras.

Opponents of assistance to the Contras, and this includes many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, must ask themselves: What happens when the Contras disappear, or are forced to dissolve? Given the likes of the Sandinista rulers, the incentive to keep these annoying vestiges of a free society disappear. They disappear with the disappearance of the Contras.

With solidified power, which, let us face it, is what the world at large really respects, what Sandinista ruler would be concerned about any remaining critical world opinion at that point. Dictators like Libya's Mu'ammar Qadhafi, certainly do not care about world opinion, and dictators like

Fidel Castro have even managed to use world opinion to their own advantage.

Can anyone imagine Interior Minister Tomas Borge seeking to mollify foreign public opinion or seeking to mollify the Organization of American States? I think not. I think it is an unimaginable possibility.

Another criticism that we hear from our Democratic colleagues, particularly those who have gone to Nicaragua and those who have seen the true colors of the Sandinista Communist regime, is that, well, they may be better than the Sandinistas, but they cannot win.

Critics argue that the Contras cannot win. But we have to ask, what is winning in a guerrilla war? Certainly it is not the great battle that decides, but it is a test of wills which continues on over the years. The critics, do these same critics except that somehow the Afghans, in their guerrilla war, will triumph over the invading Soviet Union? Yet many Nicaragua policy critics in Congress support the Afghan Freedom Fighters.

Will Son Sann's non-Communist opposition in Cambodia actually defeat the Soviet-backed Vietnamese occupation army? Of course not. But a number of critics support them, too. The nature of guerrilla war is not to win the big battle in the great big conflagration; no. The nature of guerrilla war is to make the opponent sick and tired of fighting and sick and tired of expending resources.

The Contra struggle, likewise, must be viewed over the longer range with the goal of encouraging the Soviets and the Cubans to pull out. Is not that what happened to us in Vietnam? Did the Vietcong and North Vietnamese infiltrators, did they defeat the United States main forces on the battlefield? No. No. But they made life miserable enough over the years that the majority in the American Congress eventually pulled the plug on funding that war.

Maybe, just maybe with will and determination and perseverance, that can happen in terms of the Soviets and the Cubans funding the Sandinista government in Nicaragua.

Then there is a very interesting other criticism. It is the criticism that by aiding the Contras, this will eventually lead to the use of American troops. But the critics themselves, in saying that the use of American troops might be necessary there, if a major Soviet base of operations threatening the United States would emerge, those critics are the ones really risking the use of American troops.

Why? Because a new Soviet-backed Cuba on the mainland base of operations is indeed emerging. Just look at the airfields. Just look at the barracks. Look at the training grounds.

The only effective way to discourage or deflect that emergence now, without American troops, is by Contra resistance. Once the Soviet-Cuban base is established, it is too late. It is too late for limited action. Then only American troops would suffice.

I think we have to ask the Democratic leadership and the critics in the Democratic Party whether they are prepared to risk the Nicaraguan equivalent of an American blockade or invasion of Cuba. Is that what they are telling the American people?

At that point, the cost of American lives and the cost to American treasure, dwarfs anything imaginable growing out of our extremely limited support for the Contras.

I would like to put in a word about the level of that support. We are talking about \$14 million; a fraction of the cost of one F-15. We spend nearly \$300 billion on our defense to ward off the Soviet threat, to deter the Soviet threat, and at the same time critics on the other side of the aisle, the Democratic leadership making this a litmus test vote of Democratic allegiance, are saying that this \$14 million is a waste, when it is supporting people who are willing to fight for their own freedom.

Another interesting criticism that we continue to hear is the Contras are not worth supporting because the Contras are Somozistas. Critics are arguing, I think somewhat less forcefully these days, that the Contras are the heirs to the Somoza regime; they are former Somoza national guardsmen. But it is getting harder and harder these days to brand people like Eden Pastora, the head of the ARDE alliance fighting in southern Nicaragua. It is getting harder to brand the Miskito Indians fighting to save their own culture and heritage and tradition. It is getting harder to brand Alfonso Robello, a former member of the Sandinista junta, and Adolfo Calero, head of the FDN, who was imprisoned by the Sandinistas, along with Arturo Cruz, the former Sandinista Ambassador to the United States and a leading political opponent inside Nicaragua until recently when he joined philosophical ranks with the Contras. It is getting harder and harder to brand these individuals as Somozistas.

□ 2040

What is ironic is that many of the critics during the Vietnam war characterized the Vietcong as peoples revolutionaries, they characterized the North Vietnamese as nationalists. Could we not expect the same dispensation from today's critics of the Contras, to give them credit for being nationalists, for being democratic, when indeed—and this irony is even greater—they are fighting for democratic principles to topple a totalitarian Marxist government, and at the same time the guerrillas in Vietnam and the

North Vietnamese infiltrators were fighting to install what we see today as a Communist totalitarian government?

From all that has been said in numerous press conferences and all that has been published in position papers, the Contras profess to be democrats, democrats, democrats—that's "democrats" with a small "d." They are simply asking the Sandinistas to live up to their promises to the Organization of American States, really to the Nicaraguan people. Meanwhile, while the Contras are talking like democrats across the spectrum of their organizations, the Sandinista rulers continue to talk like Soviet-Cuban allied Communist dictators. Branding the Contras "Somocistas" is name calling, it seeks to hide the embarrassing truths that the Contra leaders are seeking democratic pluralistic government, and it is pretty uncomfortable for the critics not to support their cause. It helps to cloud the issue by essentially calling them Fascists. It clouds the issue, it denigrates their cause by calling these anti-Communists Fascists. It is an old trick.

I would like to present a few facts about the Contra opposition forces which I think are important. Let us talk about, overall, the alliance that has recently been formed amongst various opposition groups to the Sandinista Communists. Several groups of the armed and unarmed opposition met in San Jose, Costa Rica, and formed a coalition called the Nicaraguan Resistance. On March 2, 1985, they issued a document calling for a national dialog with the Sandinistas under the sponsorship of the Nicaraguan Bishops Conference. In addition to the dialog, they called for a ceasefire in place, lifting the state of emergency, amnesty for some 3,500 political prisoners, granting the rights of habeas corpus and asylum, a guarantee for protection for participants in the dialog.

There is an interesting point here. Unlike the Salvadoran Communist guerrillas, they did not ask for power sharing, they are simply asking for democratic processes in their society. The national resistance offered to recognize Daniel Ortega as President pending a plebiscite. They called for the presence of guarantors from other Central American countries to oversee the proposed dialog and invited other interested nations and groups to send observers. That sounds to me like people interested in democracy.

The opposition seeks only the right to participate in a free and open election and does not demand in advance, as did the Salvadoran leftist guerrillas, a place in the government.

Within the recently formed Nicaraguan Resistance are the Nicaraguan Democratic Force, or FDN, the Democratic Revolutionary Alliance, or

ARDE, the MISURA (Miskito, Sumo, and Rama), as well as smaller or lesser known groups. MISURASATA (Sumo, Rama, and Sandinista Unity), the Frente Revolucionario Sandino (Sandino Revolutionary Front, or FRF), and others, although not signatories of the San Jose document, are also fighting to force the Sandinistas to return to the original goals of the anti-Somoza revolution.

The FDN has been branded as Somocista.

Let me say a little bit about the FDN. The FDN's policymaking Directorate, recognized in 1983, is composed of six persons. Five are civilians who were long-time opponents of Somoza. The other member is a former national guard colonel, Enrique Bermudez, who heads the military general staff. The Directorate is responsible for making and carrying out all FDN policy.

Early on, Bermudez was never recognized by the Sandinista government as being part and parcel of the dictatorial Somoza policies.

The FDN reports that its overall military leadership, including the general staff and regional and task force commanders, has a greater number of former Sandinistas than national guardsmen.

One has to ask, too, how many former national guardsmen are officers in the Sandinistas. I do not think we will get those figures.

The composition of the FDN military leadership is as follows: Former Sandinistas, 43 percent; former national guardsmen, 32 percent; campesinos, small farmers, 19 percent; and other, 6 percent.

Of the 56 regional and task force commanders in the FDN responsible for day-to-day operations, the FDN reports that 27 were former Sandinistas, 13 were national guardsmen, none above the rank of lieutenant, and 12 were farmers. The remainder include a medical doctor, an evangelical minister, a fourth year university student, and a civilian radio technician. The overwhelming number of the reported 15,000 FDN troops are peasants, workers, shopkeepers, businessmen, and others with no previous ties to Somoza.

It is a smokescreen to brand the Contras Somocistas.

Let us talk about ARDE and current groups in the Robelo-led ARDE coalition. They are the Nicaraguan democratic movement, or Movimiento Democrático Nicaraguense.

The MDN is a social-democratic party founded in 1978. It drew its support from lower and middle-class Nicaraguans, including many peasants, and it played an active role in the revolution which overthrew Somoza. Its leader, Alfonso Robelo, was an original member of the ruling Sandinista



junta. He resigned in protest over Sandinista efforts to create a Communist state. Subjected to extraordinary harassment by the Sandinistas, Robelo went into exile in Costa Rica in 1982.

There is another ARDE, headed up by former No. 1 commandante, or I should say Commandante Zero, Commander Zero, Eden Pastora, the democratic revolutionary alliance, also termed ARDE. The Costa Rica-based ARDE is a coalition of organizations created in 1982 by individuals who were active during the revolution, including many who were initially officials in the Sandinista government. From its beginning its leaders sought to restore the original course of the revolution through political means. In the spring of 1983, after peaceful efforts proved futile, ARDE began military operations in southern Nicaragua. There have been internal disagreements among various ARDE leaders. In 1984 Eden Pastora, leader of the military arm, was expelled by other members of the ARDE coalition, the one I just described, led by Alphonso Robelo. There continues to be a dispute over which faction can legitimately claim the ARDE name, with both sides doing so. Pastora has retained the loyalty of most ARDE troops and continues military operations in southern Nicaragua. And this refers to the political head of ARDE, Alphonso Robelo was a principal organizer of the Nicaraguan resistance.

MISURA is an armed group that evolved out of the Atlantic Coast Indian organization ALPROMISO, founded in 1973 with the help of Protestant churches in the region, and its successor group, MISURASATA. Former supporters of the Sandinista revolution, Miskito Indians Wycliffe Diego and Steadman Fagoth, founded MISURA in 1983. Its military operations are carried out in northeastern Nicaragua.

The Nicaraguan Democratic Solidarity, or STDN. STDN was founded in 1983 by two Nicaraguan labor leaders who had been forced into exile as a result of Sandinista persecution of the independent labor movement in Nicaragua. The founders had long been opponents of Somoza. One of them, Zacarias Hernandez, was a signer of the Nicaraguan resistance document.

□ 2050

I can go on and on; I could talk about the biographic sketches of key members of the opposition. Adolpho Calero, once imprisoned by Somoza, commander-in-chief of the FDN. I can talk about Arturo Cruz; I mentioned that he was a former Ambassador to the United States from the Sandinista government who resigned in opposition.

You can go on and on, and I think the point is made that it is not possible, it is not possible to honestly brand

the Contra resistance, Somocistas. I would hope that as we further debate this issue toward the vote next Tuesday, we cease this name calling, this smokescreen because it is simply not factual. Because it simply does not hold water.

There seems to be an overriding reality with our competition with the Soviet Union, and this overriding reality has occurred over the last decade, particularly over the last 5 years. Wars of national liberation are now being fought against Communist, totalitarian regimes, whose power can only be supported by Soviet bloc arms, economic assistance and personnel. How long would the regime in Angola last without thousands of Cuban troops propping it up? How long would it last against UNITA led by Jonas Savimbe without Cuban troops propping it up. Of course, the Cuban troops receive their logistics, their arms from the Soviet Union.

How long would the Mengistu regime last against the Eritrean resistance without thousands of Cuban troops and vast amounts of Soviet hardware. Wars of national liberation are now being fought against Communist, totalitarian regimes whose power base can only be supported by Soviet bloc arms, economic assistance and personnel. It is an important point; it is worth repeating, because it is one of the major new trends of our time.

The conflict in Nicaragua is no different. What I would hope is that my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle understand the context of that war fought by democratic forces against a Communist totalitarian power right south of the United States border.

It is a conflict being waged in a tradition similar to that in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, and Ethiopia. People are seeking freedom from Communist totalitarian rule by taking up arms against their oppressors. It is so important for my Democratic colleagues to realize that our failure to assist this trend obviates our need for example, for massive military hardware such as MX or B-1 or Starwars or fleets of fighter planes and tanks, no less large-scale, conventional armies.

If we cannot protect our back door right here at home, how can we justify these costly defenses to protect far away front lines from sophisticated technologies and major armies. This challenge right south of the border of the United States, brings very close the trend toward revolutions against Communist totalitarian regimes. How can we fail to support those challenging Communists directly south of our border?

How can my colleagues justify supporting Afghan freedom fighters half-way around the world? Cambodian freedom fighters half-way around the

world, when we cannot support freedom fighters right next door? That is the question I leave with my Democratic colleagues. I would like their answer to that question.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL INSURANCE OF ACCOUNTS—A HALF CENTURY OF SAFETY FOR DEPOSITORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, almost 100 percent of the banks and savings institutions in the United States proudly display an official Federal seal on their premises. We've become so accustomed to seeing it over the past half century that most of us no longer notice it. As a matter of fact, that seal has been so effective in accomplishing the purpose for which the Federal agencies it represents were created that many have forgotten why it was considered necessary in the first place.

Congress established the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the darkest days of the worst economic crisis every to beset our country. Our country then—in the thirties—was in deep economic depression, wracked with joblessness, with hunger and homelessness on a scale unrivaled in American history. Confidence in America's ability to right itself was eroding rapidly. It bottomed when frantic citizens lost faith and trust in their financial institutions. There were runs on banks. Bank failures were so widespread it appeared our entire system of depository institutions would come crashing down.

It was at that point a wise and concerned Congress rewrote the laws under which our depository institutions operated. These laws continue to form the basic framework of our financial system. One key to the continuing success of our depository system was the establishment of a Federal deposit insurance system—a system designed to assure depositors their Federal Government stands 100

percent behind their dollars on deposits up to the present limit of \$100,000.

The FSLIC and the FDIC, authorized as they are to call upon the U.S. Treasury for assistance if needed, have consistently made good on their commitments to depositors.

Congress recently reiterated the intent of the insurance funds' creators by adopting a resolution stating that the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government stands behind the deposits in federally insured institutions up to \$100,000 per account.

The stability of our financial system is the envy of the world. We have the FSLIC and the FDIC to thank for that, because for over half a century depositors have had their deposits secured by Federal deposit insurance.

As the chairman of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in which the Federal deposit insurance funds had their legislative origins, I am gratified that this system has inspired the confidence and good will of millions upon millions of account holders.

I shall do all in my power to assure that this confidence continues.●

#### WHY SUPPORT THE NICARAGUAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Capital Hilton Hotel, the friends and admirers of America's U.N. Ambassador, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, joined to honor her for her long and distinguished career at the United Nations, and to express their appreciation for Dr. Kirkpatrick's unique capability of expressing views on complex foreign policy issues in straight-forward, down-to-Earth, sensible terms.

The more than 700 persons who filled the hotel's ballroom applauded as Ambassador Kirkpatrick was presented with plaques and other expressions of appreciation by 15 outstanding organizations, not only in this country but also in Nicaragua. The dinner was coordinated by the American Security Council for the coalition for peace through strength.

The Ambassador responded by speaking on the No. 1 political issue of the day—"Why Support the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters?"

Since this is an issue which every Member of the House will be called upon to vote next week, I believe a careful reading of Dr. Kirkpatrick's eloquent and moving address should be mandatory for every Member before casting his or her vote on this issue of vital importance to the entire Western Hemisphere.

The address follows:

**SALUTE TO AMBASSADOR JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK, APRIL 16, 1985, CAPITAL HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, DC**

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK: Thank you John; thank you Adolfo; thank you Bill; thank you Ed; thank you Frank; thank you everybody. I thank all of you. I was concerned about Don Hodel (phonetic). Did he ever get to sit down? Okay.

This is obviously a very pleasant evening. I see a great many friends. I see a few whom I have spent a lot of time with at the United Nations like Andy Ireland and Sam Stratton. I always feel like giving them awards, let me say. Any Congressional member who came to the U.N. and really stayed around and helped us do a job won my very special gratitude.

While I am saying "thank you", I want to say "thank you" to my friend Cap Weinberger, very particularly, for his generous words about me tonight, but also especially in this assembly, Peace Through Strength. Thinking of that theme, I want to thank Cap Weinberger for his most extraordinary contributions to restoring this nation to its strength so that we can in fact seek Peace Through Strength.

I think that John Fisher has his upon an extraordinary way to keep everybody within their time limits because obviously we don't get any dinner until we stop talking. So, I am going to skip the first four pages of my prepared remarks, mainly, but not entirely.

I do want to say what I take to be the principal function of our foreign policy. I take that to be defending our own nation and its democratic institutions against external attack or subversion; defending our allies against external attack or subversion, and preserving our civilization, the kind of world in which we can live and thrive and enjoy our lives; a world of independent nations with whom we can trade, among whom we can travel; nations which will not pursue aggressive expansionist policies and destroy the peace of their neighbors.

I take it to be a purpose of our foreign policy to promote democratic institutions and human rights and economic development everywhere. I take it to be a function of our foreign policy as well to manage our foreign relations in such a way that they do not consume too large a share of our resources, time, effort, and money. I think those are the things that President Reagan has, in fact, been trying to do and I think it's the thing that Cap and a great many of us who are here, in the Congress as well as the Administration have tried to do.

I think no place have we tried to work towards these goals more persistently than in Central America. Now, it's never useful to over simplify and we need to recognize that there are various kinds of obstacles to the achievement of our goals. There are stubborn problems of climate and culture and politics, history, mutual insecurity and animosities, and deep set rivalries, and they often stand in the way of achieving our goals. The fact is that we also need to recognize that the principal obstacle to our security and also to our helping preserving and enjoying our civilization and our world is unfortunately, the expansionist policies of the Soviet Union.

I believe that there were two principal dimensions to the so-called "Changed Correlation of World Forces" that we heard so much about in the period before 1981. The "Changed Correlation of World Forces", I think consisted of two parts; the growth of Soviet military power, and the concomitant decline in the military strength of the West,

and the dramatic expansion of Soviet influence outside Europe and North America.

We all know the development of Soviet military power is important. It permitted an extraordinary buildup in the Pacific, created new vulnerabilities in Europe, created new vulnerabilities here at home. We also know in principal that we can deal with that by restoring our own military establishment, and also by trying to get a handle on the Arms Race through verifiable agreements arrived at in Arms Control Negotiations.

The fact is that we don't even have an adequate theory of how to deal with Soviet expansion outside Europe and North America. In just 20 years the Soviet Union progressed from being a continental power in Europe to becoming a global power, acquiring bases and surrogates you all know, in Cuba, Vietnam, Ethiopia, Angola, South Yemen, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, expanding its military reach to the vicinity of such strategic checkpoints as the Panama Canal, Straits of Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, Straits of Hormus, the entrance to the Red Sea, and the Indian Ocean, the sea lanes of East Asia, and so forth, Cam Rahn Bay.

In the same period, the number of Soviet and block troops in non-Soviet non-Warsaw Pact countries increased more than 500 percent. From that point of view, that period between 1975 and 1980 was a period of great success.

We need to be clear about what they mean by "success" in thinking about the Third World and in thinking about the countries outside North America and Europe. What they mean is the incorporation of a country into the world socialist system, or at least a reliable beginning in the process of incorporating a country into the world socialist system.

Their view of success is very different than our view. Our view of success is, in fact, to help a country preserve its independence. We have succeeded when a country avoids incorporation and maintains its independence.

It's an interesting difference in what happens to countries where they succeed and where we succeed. Where they succeed, the country is incorporated into a global military mutual-aid society, in which armaments and services from all the member states of the Soviet empire are drawn and brought to bear on unfortunate targeted countries.

From our point of view, when we succeed, the country that is successful may not make any contribution at all to collective enterprise. It may not extend any basing rights, for example, for collective purposes. It may not help its neighbors maintain their independence. So be it. That's our kind of success. We are not seeking to build an empire. We are not seeking client states. We do seek a world of independent nations.

The only problem is that the expansion of Soviet power and the incorporation of ever larger numbers of nations into the world socialist system is dangerous for us and for other independent nations.

I might note that this incorporation usually takes place incrementally; one slice at a time, like salami tactics applied to international politics.

The process of incorporation into the world socialist system was described in the Granada Documents, which I'm sure many here have read. The stages in this process are not complete until full military integration of a country into the world socialist system has been achieved. It had not yet



been achieved in Granada. It has been achieved in Cuba. Cuba integration into the Soviet Military System is symbolized by the presence in Cuba of some Soviet personnel. For example, some seven thousand civilian advisors; some 2800 in that famous combat brigade; some seven—I'm sorry. Some 2800 military advisors, plus about 2,000 special Soviet personnel who are manning an electronic intelligence facility that monitors our electronic communications here in the United States.

Cuba, of course, provides bases that extend the reach of Soviet naval and air power and electronic surveillance over our coastal waters and our coast. Cuba provides advisors and troops for Nicaragua, Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Congo, South Yemen. Cuba provides manpower and planning for the drug and terror network that reaps chaos in Latin America and mightily affects our own country.

Nicaragua has been partially, but not wholly incorporated into the Soviet military world system. Nicaragua provides training, arms for guerrillas from a dozen countries. Nicaragua provides a home, refuge, sanctuary, for the international terrorist network. Indeed, its capital has become Managua where one finds Bader Meinhof (phonetic) remnants, Red Brigades, Basque, ETA Members, Argentine Monteros and ERP, Peruvian Sendero-Luminoso (phonetic), and Marta El Salvadoran FMLN, of course, Guerrillas from all over the world meet there with their PLO mentors and exchange notes and train one another. Of course, with a little help from the Libyans.

One of the consequences of this steady flow of services and manpower to the—Nicaragua, and from Nicaragua to other countries in Central America and South America is the kind of tragedy I visited in El Salvador last weekend, when I visited the hamlet—It's not even, really a village, where the massacre of the previous days had taken place. Where some 19 Salvadorans had been dragged from their beds and killed in cold blood. I say the style in which seven men had been shot, and one had his head crushed. I was with our Ambassador who picked up a shell casing which bears on it a Number "10", which I am told is a definitive marking of such casings of Bulgarian make.

Where do the bullets in El Salvador's hamlets come from? They come from Bulgaria. Where do the bullets used against Nicaragua's own democrats and Freedom Fighters come from? Well, they come from Bulgaria too, and of course from Vietnam, and from East Germany and Czechoslovakia, and from the Soviet Union. The struggle that is underway today in Central America has very special significance for us, and I presume everyone here understands that.

True, we live in a big inter-dependent world, and events in very remote places can have a large impact on us. A coup in Sudan, a civil war in Angola, a Vietnamese offensive in Cambodia, a conversation between Chinese and Soviets, a struggle in New Caledonia, a Presidential election in Greece, a massacre in El Salvador, may have all of them important effects on our well being and our national security, but not all situations in all places are equally important to us. Not all deserve the same attention from our Government, and not all decisions of our Government deserve the same attention from American citizens.

In thinking about foreign policy and national security, one must begin with geography, because in foreign affairs, geography is destiny. In thinking about foreign

policy, one must end with ideals of one's civilization, because they provide the—literally, the spiritual food and intellectual food off which we live.

Developments in Nicaragua matter more to us than developments in many other countries, because Nicaragua is at the center of the isthmus that stretches south to Panama, north to Mexico. Those countries constitute our fourth border, and that gives Central America and the Caribbean an irreducible strategic importance for us.

Now, we're not accustomed to thinking strategically and we're not accustomed to thinking about any potential vulnerabilities that we may have. The Soviets are. They began thinking as early as 1967 about the strategic vulnerabilities for the United States that could be created if they could threaten our security on our southern border.

Nicaragua can constitute a security problem for the United States of major proportions. Not because they establish a socialist economic system, though we regret that and we know it will fail; not because they create a repressive new military dictatorship under which the people of Nicaragua suffer, though we regret that very deeply, and we think the people of Nicaragua deserve better; not because they expose ideas we find obnoxious and untrue, though we regret that too. Nicaragua constitutes a security problem actual and potential, especially for the United States because it is being very rapidly integrated into the socialist military world system. It is advanced into the process of incorporation into that Soviet world system.

Today, everyone who cares to know, knows that Nicaragua, whose Government began as a broad based coalition with important democratic presence, is today wholly controlled by communist leaders and that situation came into being because the Marxist guerrillas had a monopoly of weapons.

Everyone who cares to know, knows that the Nicaraguan Junta Representatives went soon after they achieved power to Moscow, where they were greeted by General Secretary Chynyeko and Foreign Minister Gromeyko (phonetic), where they signed a party to party agreement, among other things, approving the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Everyone who cares to know, knows today that the Government of Nicaragua is sustained by Cuba, whose advisors started arriving in days after the victory, and it is sustained by the famous Internationalists from all over the Soviet block.

Everyone who cares to know, knows today in Nicaragua the Government is repressive, the economy is in shambles, and hope flies with the democratic resistance forces.

You know, sometimes we like to console ourselves with believing that things are not as bad as some people say and that after all, the Sandinistas might turn out to have a falling out with Cuba and the Soviet Union, and Cuba might turn out to have a falling out with the Soviet Union, and that if only we were more obliging or understanding than we are, there would be nothing to worry about, and we could all live happily together in this hemisphere forever after.

I think of that perspective because just before I came here tonight I missed the reception because I was appearing on McNeill-Larrel (phonetic) where I encountered some people who seemed to have that view. Just before that, I was testifying before the House Sub-Committee on Foreign Affairs

on this subject where I met some people who seemed to have that view. You know, the kind of people that tells us that we drove Fidel Castro into the hands of the Soviet Union even though Fidel Castro himself tells us that he had been an apprentice Marxist-Leninist for years before he came to power and had disguised his true beliefs.

What can the United States do in this situation? I think we can help Nicaragua's Freedom Fighters, that's what we can do. We should assist Nicaragua's Freedom Fighters, because it helps Nicaraguans and it helps the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters themselves, who are not only decent and upright, but a very impressive group of democrats working now for democracy in their country as each of them has worked for democracy for Nicaragua for years in the past. We can help them because they are good men whom we should be proud to help. We can help them because it helps the region, and we can help them because it helps us.

Will Congress permit the President to provide the 14 Million Dollars of assistance to the Nicaraguan Forces fighting against the consolidation of a communist government in their own country? That is the question which is confronting the Congress and this country today. I believe that the answer to that question, given by the Congress, will effect the fate of Nicaragua; effect the stability of Nicaragua's democratic neighbors; Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras. It will effect the evolution of other countries in the region, including Guatemala, Panama, Mexico. It will effect the security of the United States, the cost of our defenses, the strength or our alliances for many years to come.

Above all, I believe the decision to be made by the Congress will seriously effect the possibilities for peace in the next decade.

You know, very often in human affairs, peoples intentions lead them to actions which defeat their intentions. The problem with the kind of self-defeating appeasement that is, in my opinion, involved in a refusal to support Nicaragua's resistance forces is that it doesn't work.

I was reading recently an old book of Walter Lipman, when he was talking about the period before World War II, and he said in that book, and I quote, "The Surrender of the Rhineland in 1936; of Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938, were the strategic preliminaries to the neutralization of Russia and the conquest of Poland in 1939; that is what was surrendered by our allies in the name of peace became the strategic foundation upon which Hitler prosecuted his war." Thus, do the best intentions of flawed policy makers sometimes go astray.

You know, mistakes when individuals make them are always regrettable and sometimes they are serious, but the mistakes of Government are more serious than the mistakes of individuals. If I make a mistake it involves only me and my family, probably, and maybe a friend or two. When Governments make mistakes, whole societies suffer. Often those mistakes are honest, but the costs are no less high because of the honesty and good intentions of those who make the mistakes.

Some people say we should not support Nicaragua's Freedom Fighters because we should leave the problems of Central America to the Central Americans and the problems of Nicaragua to the Nicaraguans. My response to that is that we would like nothing better than to leave the problems of Nicaragua to the Nicaraguans. Exactly the

point is that Nicaragua's fate is not being left to the Nicaraguans. It is being determined by people and guns from very remote places, by heavy armaments, major weapons systems from Eastern Europe and by Guerrillas and Internationalists from every terrorist nation in the world.

Colonel Cadafy has mentioned that he would send his troops to fight in Nicaragua. As I understand it, he's been helping the Nicaraguans for quite a long time, so there will be nothing new about that.

I would like to say in closing that today the United States Congress authorizes more than—and appropriates and provides, more than 15 Billion Dollars of economic and military assistance to nations and groups in the world. That's a lot of money, 15 Billion Dollars.

We provide some millions of dollars to freedom fighters fighting in remote parts of the world. Now, I support most of that foreign economic and military assistance and I support certainly all that assistance to freedom fighters in remote places, but I should like to say that it makes no sense at all, moral or political, or intellectual, or strategic sense, to refuse to provide help for the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters today.

Let me just say that the most terrible mistake that we could make would be to conclude that the struggle in Nicaragua does not concern us, or that the Nicaraguans are in some sense not ready for democracy. The fact is that their struggle is our struggle, and their freedom and our freedom are indivisible, and if we do not understand that now in time to help Nicaraguans to help themselves and stand with those who stand for freedom in that country, we will, I am afraid, learn that lesson under much more painful circumstances not too far in the future.

Thank you.●

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GINGRICH) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, for 60 minutes, May 14.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, April 22.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, April 23.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, April 24.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, April 25.

Mr. RITTER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GALLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, April 18.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HERTEL of Michigan) to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAYES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CROCKETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, April 18.

Mr. SOLARZ, for 60 minutes, April 18.

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, for 60 minutes, April 23.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RITTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 60 minutes, April 25.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COURTER in two instances.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. FIELDS in four instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HERTEL of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. ENGLISH.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. BRUCE.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. BARNES.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. WIRTH.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to designate May 7, 1985, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day."

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 18, 1985, at 11 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1054. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 6-17, "Interest Rate Ceiling Amendment Clarification Act of 1985," and report, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1055. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to discontinue or amend certain requirements for agency reports to Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1056. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the refugee assistance authorities of the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1057. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development and the President/Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a semiannual report on the amount and extension of credits under the Trade Credit Insurance Program (TCIP); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Foreign Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on unnecessary firing of tactical missiles demands DOD's attention (Rept. No. 99-45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on the impact of the budget process on offices of inspector general (Rept. No. 99-46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union discharged, and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for period ending not later than May 2, 1985, for consideration of such provisions of the bill (H.R. 1931) and



amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 1(p), rule X.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. FEIGAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 2068. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board of International Broadcasting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. FLIPPO, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 2069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make permanent the rules relating to imputed interest and assumption of loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. GRADISON):

H.R. 2070. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend hospice benefits under the Medicare Program for an additional 3 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 2071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts which are received from a public retirement system and which are attributable to services as a Federal, State, or local policeman or fireman; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude \$2,000 from the gross income of auxiliary policemen and volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to lower the limitation on defined benefit plan established for policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2074. A bill to establish a national lottery to reduce the Federal deficit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA

H.R. 2075. A bill to make permanent the free rate of customs duty on fresh cantaloupes imported at certain times, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DiGUARDI (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. RALPH M. HALL):

H.R. 2076. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prepare a report on the health effects of cocaine use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 2077. A bill to provide for wheat loan, export marketing certificate, export differential payment, and acreage limitation programs, to authorize an agricultural export subsidy program under certain conditions, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS:

H.R. 2078. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the

use of certain transferable passes for air transportation service by an individual who is not an employee of any trade or business providing such service shall be treated as use by an employee for purposes of the fringe benefit exclusion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 2079. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide certain individuals living abroad an exclusion for income from sources within foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LELAND (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DIXON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. WEISS):

H.R. 2080. A bill to provide funds for food assistance and African agricultural development; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of political contribution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax gain the sale of an individual's principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to group-term life insurance purchased for employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the amount of the charitable deduction allowable for expenses incurred in the operation of a motor vehicle will be determined in the same manner Government employees determine reimbursement for use of their vehicles on Government business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax-exempt interest on certain governmental obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2086. A bill to extend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make certain changes in the tax treatment of private foundations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2087. A bill to amend to Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the treatment of trucking industry plans under rules governing multiemployer plans and to make certain other improvements in such rules; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan:

H.R. 2088. A bill to provide for coordinated management and rehabilitation of the Great Lakes and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science and Technology and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOWARD (by request):

H.R. 2089. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to advance the scheduled termination date of the Essential Air Service Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2090. A bill to review and extend certain provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself and Mr. SNYDER) (by request):

H.R. 2091. A bill to amend and extend title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. DANNEMEYER) (by request):

H.R. 2092. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself and Mr. KOSTMAYER):

H.R. 2093. A bill to recognize the organization known as Veterans of the Vietnam War, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 2094. A bill to prohibit the purchase of nondomestic uranium by Federal agencies and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 2095. A bill to provide for daylight saving time on an expanded basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON of Washington:

H.R. 2096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain an enlarged Bumping Lake, supplemental storage division, Yakima project, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2097. A bill to recognize the organization known as the American Philatelic Society; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2098. A bill to recognize the organization known as the Fleet Reserve Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIDGE:

H.R. 2099. A bill to restore competitive equity between national and State banks regarding shared automatic teller machine networks; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 2100. A bill to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. SCHNEIDER (for herself and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 2101. A bill to establish in the Environmental Protection Agency a program on indoor air quality, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2102. A bill to establish State pension investment units, a secondary market for industrial mortgages, State venture capital and royalty finance corporations, and a national loan loss reserve fund; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SKELTON:

H.R. 2103. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act relating to the inspection and labeling of certain imported meat and meat food products, to require that certain eating establishments serving imported meat inform customers of that fact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2104. A bill to provide the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to establish a program to develop, maintain, and expand markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2105. A bill to establish an agricultural export credit revolving fund, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUTTO (for himself, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. McGRATH):

H.J. Res. 241. Joint resolution directing the President to ensure that Soviet Government personnel in the United States are subject to the same requirements as are U.S. Government personnel in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Poverty Definition Reform; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. FREIGHAN, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution condemning the use of plastic or rubber bullets by British security forces in Northern Ireland and calling upon the Government of the United Kingdom to end the use of such bullets against civilians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LELAND:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should consider the members of the African National Congress in South Africa to be freedom fighters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should withdraw the determination that the Government of Haiti is making progress toward improving the human rights situation in Haiti and progress toward implementing political reforms which are essential to the development of democracy in Haiti, such as progress toward the establishment of political parties, free elections, and freedom of the press; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIOGUARDI (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut):

H. Res. 132. Resolution condemning the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for 5 years of forced and oppressive military occupation of Afghanistan in the face of popular resistance to Soviet imperialism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 21: Mr. BATES, Mr. YATES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 36: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 43: Mr. BIAGGI and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 44: Mr. STRANG, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. SABO, and Mr. QUILLIN.

H.R. 52: Mr. CRAIG and Mr. RAY.

H.R. 229: Mr. DE LUGO and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.R. 385: Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REID, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. WHITTAKER, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 472: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. STRANG, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 479: Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COBEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MICA, and Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 480: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 521: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 528: Mr. LENT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. RALPH M. HALL.

H.R. 580: Mr. SHELBY, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. PEPPER.

H.R. 620: Mr. RUDD.

H.R. 650: Mr. ROSE, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 691: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 693: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 695: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 749: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 825: Mr. TAUKE, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 917: Mr. WEISS and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 930: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 999: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 1017: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 1063: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HUTTO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 1089: Mr. BONER of Tennessee.

H.R. 1123: Mr. BADHAM, Mrs. BOGGS, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 1142: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1180: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FLORIO, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 1188: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MONSON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. McCURDY, Ms. FIEDLER, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. KRAMER.

H.R. 1272: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 1294: Mr. ROE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1434: Mr. ADDABO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LELAND, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1436: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1476: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1511: Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 1520: Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1541: Mr. SABO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1552: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BEILSON, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. STARK, Mr. BEUTER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 1594: Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1611: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 1612: Mr. STRANG, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MONSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. McCURDY, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1613: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 1644: Mr. HYDE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 1660: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RALPH M. HALL.

H.R. 1695: Mr. OWENS and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 1722: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1776: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1779: Mr. APPELGADE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FISH, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. McDADDE, and Mr. KEMP.

H.R. 1796: Mr. LENT.

H.R. 1815: Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 1927: Mr. SABO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WALGREN, and Mrs. BURTON of California.

H.R. 1932: Mr. DENNY SMITH and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1977: Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. TALLON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.J. Res. 3: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAUKE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. YATES, Mr. CARPER, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STRATTON.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. COELHO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DAUB, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 128: Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. BARNES, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. OLIN, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HERTZEL of Michigan, Mr. MICA, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HILER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. RUDD, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr.



HOPKINS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. O'BRIEN.

H.J. Res. 151: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.J. Res. 154: Mr. TALLON, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. COATS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.J. Res. 192: Mr. FISH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LENT, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. OLIN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MANTON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. REID, Mr. DARDEN,

Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. EARLY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BATES, Mr. LATTI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DYSON, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HEFTL of Hawaii, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MOLINARI.

H.J. 205: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STRANG, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. FOWLER.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. DASCHLE and Mr. RUDD.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 82: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. APPLEGATE.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. CARR.

H. Res. 60: Mr. DARDEN.

H. Res. 122: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. OLIN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H. Res. 126: Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1612: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1617

By Mr. PURSELL:

—In section 3 (page 7, line 7), strike out "\$600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

—At the end of section 2 (page 7, after line 2), add the following new subsection:

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this section shall not exceed \$123,985,000.